DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 817 UD 005 167

By-Stetler, Henry G.

ATTITUDES TOWARD RACIAL INTEGRATION IN CONNECTICUT.

Connecticut Commission on Civil Rights, Hartford.
Pub Date 61
Note-60p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$2.48
Descriptors-CAUCASIANS, *DISCRIMINATORY ATTITUDES (SOCIAL), INTERVIEWS, NEGROES, *NORTHERN ATTITUDES, *RACE RELATIONS, *RACIAL ATTITUDES, *RACIAL INTEGRATION, TABLES (DATA)
Identifiers-Connecticut

Through interviews this study investigated the racial attitudes and practices of 577 Negroes and 556 whites living in metropolitan areas of Connecticut, and the effect of the school desegregation drive in the South on these attitudes and practices. Three-fourths of the whites and nearly all the Negroes agreed with the Supreme Court decision to end segregated schooling. More than half of the respondents from both races felt that the drive for Southern school desegregation had positively affected race relations in Connecticut. One-fifth of the whites and three-fifths of the Negroes wanted complete integration "now," whereas more than one-half of the whites volunteered that they were opposed to intermarriage. Interracial contact occurred with greater frequency among the whites with favorable integration attitudes and among those persons with a higher education. Whites tended to underestimate the feelings of Negroes on the issue of more integration. (BD)

ATTITUDES TOWARD RACIAL INTEGRATION IN CONNECTICUT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

By

Henry G. Stetler

Supervisor, Research Division

Connecticut Commission on Civil Rights

UD 005 167

ED022817

Prepared for

The Commission on Civil Rights

of the

State of Connecticut

Hartford, Connecticut

1961

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

COMMISSIONERS

ELMO ROPER
Chairman, West Redding

RALPH M. GOGLIA
Deputy Chairman, West Haven

MRS. SARAH G. ROSENTHAL
Secretary, Branford

REV. CHARLES C. BLAKE, D.D.
New Haven

LOUIS FEINMARK
New Haven

HON. IRWIN E. FRIEDMAN
Fairfield

RT. REV. MSGR. JOSEPH M. GRIFFIN
Meriden

ALLEN F. JACKSON, M.D.
Hartford

RAY O'CONNOR
Westport

RABBI MORRIS SILVERMAN, D.H.L.
Hartford

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

THOMAS F. HENRY

CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	v
Summary of Principal Findings	vii
I. Introduction	1
II. Characteristics of the Respondents	7
III. Impact of Southern School Desegregation Drive in Connecticut	16
IV. Racial Integration: General Attitudes	22
V. Racial Integration: Specific Attitudes	28
VI. Racial Integration: Types of Contact	39
VII. Conclusions	45

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study of *Attitudes Toward Racial Integration in Connecticut* was conducted by the research division of the Connecticut State Commission on Civil Rights. The membership of the Research Committee of the Commission consists of Ralph M. Goglia, chairman, Dr. Allen F. Jackson, and Ray O'Connor.

The Commission on Civil Rights acknowledges the generous cooperation of the following persons who aided the research division in securing interviewers in the various metropolitan areas covered by the study: Mrs. Naomi Gordon, Chairman of the Education Committee of the Human Relations Council of Greater New Haven; Mrs. Shirley Wachtel, American Jewish Congress, Hartford; Mrs. Willa G. Coleman, New London; Dr. Jane Torrey, Connecticut College for Women, New London; Mr. Frank Corbett, Executive Director, Bridgeport Intergroup Council; Mrs. Aaron Cuffee, President, National Council of Negro Women, Bridgeport; Mr. T. Carter Dodd, Stamford-Norwalk Council of Churches; and Mrs. Jeanne Cohn, American Jewish Congress, Stamford.

The Commission acknowledges the valuable advice given by Mrs. Carolyn Crusius and Dr. Gerhart D. Wiebe of the firm of Elmo Roper and Associates, New York City, particularly with regard to the interviewing schedule and data analysis.

The study was directed by Dr. Henry G. Stetler, supervisor of the research division, who also prepared the final manuscript. Mr. Albert J. Leet, research sociologist, rendered valuable assistance in many phases of the study, including coding, tabulation, and analysis of data, and coordination of the work of the field interviewers. Miss Elizabeth Krom, field representative in the education division, contributed generously to the interpretation of data. Mrs. Carletta W. Jennings, research assistant, participated in the field interviewing, assisted in coding, prepared tables, and typed successive drafts of the manuscript.

LIST OF TABLES

Table Number		
1.	Age, Sex, Birthplace and Race of Respondents	7
2.	Place of Residence and Length of Residence in Connecticut	8
3.	Type of Home and Type of Neighborhood	8
4.	Occupation of Respondents	10
5.	Occupation of Respondent or Spouse, by Age	11
6.	Total Family Income	11
7.	Occupation of Respondent or Spouse, by total Family Income	12
8.	Education of Respondent and Spouse	13
9.	Education of Respondents, by Age	14
10.	Occupation of Respondent or Spouse, by Education	15
11.	Religion of Respondents	15
12.	Attitude Toward Supreme Court Decision, by Education	17
13.	Effect of Southern School Desegregation Drive on Race Relations in Connecticut	17
14.	Specific Effects of Southern School Desegregation Drive on Race Relations in Connecticut by Education of White Respondents	18
15.	Specific Effects of Southern School Desegregation Drive on Race Relations in Connecticut, by Education of Negro Respondents	19
16.	Change in Race Relations in Connecticut During Past Five Years	20
17.	Conduct of Southern Whites in Public School Controversy	21
18.	Conduct of Southern Negroes in Public School Controversy	21
19.	Understanding of the Concept of "Racial Integration"	22
20.	Understanding of the Concept of "Racial Integration," by Education	23
21.	Understanding of the Concept of "Racial Integration," by total Family Income	23
22.	Desirability of Complete Racial Integration	24
23.	Desirability of Complete Racial Integration, by Education	24
24.	Change in Racial Integration in Connecticut During Past Five Years	25
25.	Reasons for Increase in Racial Integration in Connecticut During Past Five Years, by Education of White Respondents	26

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd.)

Table Number		
26.	Reasons for Increase in Racial Integration in Connecticut During Past Five Years, by Education of Negro Respondents	27
27.	Attitudes Toward Specific Areas of Racial Integration	29
28.	Attitude Toward Integration in Private Residential Neighborhoods, by Education of White Respondents	31
29.	Attitude Toward Integration in Private Residential Neighborhoods, by Type of Neighborhood of White Respondents	31
30.	Attitude Toward Integration at Parties, by Education	32
31.	Integration Score of Respondents	33
32.	Attitude Toward Complete Integration, by Integration Score	34
33.	Integration Score, by Selected Characteristics of White Respondents	35
34.	Comparative Characteristics of White Respondents Having the Most Favorable Integration Score (Upper 17%) and the Least Favorable Integration Score (Lower 22%)	37
35.	Recency of Interracial Contacts of White Respondents	39
36.	Recency of Interracial Contacts of Negro Respondents	39
37.	Recency of Interracial Contacts of White Respondents, by Integration Score	39
38.	Types of Contact Between Whites and Negroes	40
39.	Types of Contact Between Whites and Negroes by Integration Score of White Respondents	41
40.	Types of Contact Between Whites and Negroes, by Education	42
41.	Attitudes Toward More Contact Between Whites and Negroes	42
42.	White and Negro Respondents' Evaluation of Each Other's Attitudes Toward Racial Integration	43
43.	Interracial Activities Engaged in by Respondents Who Felt There Should Be More Integration	44

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

This is a study of integration attitudes and interracial practices of whites and Negroes living in Connecticut, and of the effect of the Southern school desegregation drive on these attitudes and practices during the past five years. The findings are based on interviews with 556 white and 527 Negro respondents residing in the urban and suburban portions of the Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven, New London, Stamford, and Waterbury metropolitan areas of Connecticut.

Impact of the Southern school desegregation drive

Three-fourths of the white and 94% of the Negro respondents agreed that the U. S. Supreme Court "did the right thing" in 1954 when it decided that racial segregation in public schools was unconstitutional.

The majority of white (55%) and Negro (65%) respondents felt that the drive to desegregate schools in the South had had some effect on race relations in Connecticut. In most cases, these same respondents felt that the effect had been of a positive nature, in the sense that relations between the races tended to be improved. Only a third of the respondents of both races felt that the Southern situation had had no effect in Connecticut.

Those positive results cited most frequently were an increased awareness of racial problems, an increased sense of ethical responsibility, and improvement in attitudes toward Negroes. The better educated respondents of both racial groups cited positive results most frequently.

Forty-five percent of the white and 68% of the Negro respondents felt that there had been some improvement in race relations in Connecticut during the past five years. One-fourth of the respondents in both groups felt that there had been no change. Only a small proportion of the white (8%) and Negro (4%) respondents felt that relations had deteriorated. Improvement was cited most frequently by those respondents in both racial groups who had resided in Connecticut more than 35 years, least frequently by those who had been in the state less than 15 years.

Our white and Negro respondents were in substantial agreement over the conduct of white Southerners in the public school controversy. Forty percent of the white and 53% of the Negro respondents felt that Southern whites were conducting themselves "not well at all," whereas only 11% of the white and 4% of the Negro respondents felt the same way about the conduct of Southern Negroes.

General attitudes toward racial integration

Complete racial integration in Connecticut, defined as "white and colored people taking part together, without regard to race, in everything that goes on in the community" was accepted as "desirable now" by only one-fifth of the white respondents compared with three-fifths of the Negro respondents. More than half of the white respondents wanted

to "move slowly" toward such a goal, and 17% felt that it was an undesirable goal.

Despite a cautious attitude toward the desirability of immediate and complete integration, half of the white respondents felt that there had been some increase in Connecticut during the past five years. White respondents living in racially mixed neighborhoods were more conscious of this change than those living in "all-white" neighborhoods.

Education, civil rights legislation, and more opportunities for interracial contacts were given by both racial groups as principal reasons for an increase in integration during the past five years.

Specific attitudes toward racial integration

With regard to specific areas of racial integration, white respondents expressed a wide diversity of attitudes. About 70% favored integration in public schools, employment and churches; 59% to 60% favored integration in places of public accommodation, such as hotels and restaurants; and less than 40% favored integration in any type of housing (public or private), or in activities involving social relationships such as clubs or parties. In each of these areas, about one-fourth of the white respondents said they would "accept, but not encourage" integration. Outright opposition to integration ranged from 3% in the areas of public schools and employment to 37% in private housing, and 46% in private social activities.

Among white respondents, the proportion with favorable attitudes toward integration in any of the areas of activity usually tended to be greater among the better-educated, higher-income, white-collar groups; also greater among men than women.

In sharp contrast, Negro respondents showed no such diversity in their attitudes. At least 90% favored integration in employment, public schools, all public accommodations, all housing (public or private) and churches. Even in activities of a purely social nature, such as fraternities, clubs, and parties, the proportion of Negro respondents with favorable attitudes toward integration was substantially greater than that of whites and never dropped below 63%.

The gulf separating whites and Negroes in Connecticut on attitudes toward racial integration in their own state is illustrated by a comparison of the "integration scores" of our respondents. The "integration score" is a composite rating of each respondent based on his attitudes toward integration in each of 14 specific areas of activity (employment, public schools, private schools, churches, recreation areas, restaurants, hotels, swimming pools, fraternities, public housing, apartments, private residential neighborhoods, social clubs, and parties). After ascribing weights to each specific attitude, a combined "score" was computed for each respondent which reflected his relative position on a scale ranging from those with a most favorable disposition to those with a least favorable disposition toward integration. When we selected the upper third of the white respondents—those having the most favorable attitudes toward integration—we found that by comparison 86% of the Negro respondents

had similar scores. And if we took the lower third of the white respondents—those having least favorable attitudes toward integration—we found them matched by only 1% of the Negro respondents.

About one-half of the white, and one-fifth of the Negro respondents volunteered the information that they were opposed to racial intermarriage. This was in response to a question asking the respondent whether there was any other area of interracial activity (not specifically mentioned earlier) in which he opposed racial intermixing. The replies probably underestimate the proportion in both racial groups actually opposed to intermarriage because of the non-directed nature of the question.

Contacts between whites and Negroes in Connecticut

Four-fifths of the white and 97% of the Negro respondents talked with members of the other race at some time or another. Forty-four percent of the whites and 78% of the Negroes said that such contact had occurred within the past week. About half of the respondents of both races said that such contacts occurred in the course of their employment. About one-fifth of the whites said that such contacts occurred in organizations, or as friends or neighbors.

Interracial contacts occurred with considerably greater frequency among those persons having a college or professional school education than among those having something less than a complete high school education.

White respondents having the most favorable attitudes toward racial integration also had more frequent contacts with Negroes, whether at employment, in organizations, at school or college, or simply as friends or neighbors.

With regard to the future status of contacts between whites and Negroes in Connecticut, a far greater proportion of Negro than white respondents felt that there should be more. Eighty-four percent of the Negro, in comparison with 35% of the white respondents felt that whites and Negroes "should get together more."

White respondents tended to underestimate grossly the feelings of Negro respondents on the question of more integration. Only 10% of the whites felt that Negroes wanted more integration, whereas, in fact, 84% of the Negro respondents said that they wanted more integration.

Many respondents in both racial groups whose attitudes toward the extension of integration were favorable said that they had already taken the initiative in inviting members of the other race to their homes or to join their organizations. However, 45% of the white respondents felt that "things are all right as they are," and 8% felt that there should actually be less integration than already existed.

Characteristics of the respondents

The majority of the white respondents were born in New England or the Middle Atlantic States; the majority of the Negro respondents were born in the South. Despite the difference in region of

birth, a majority both of white and Negro respondents had resided in Connecticut 15 or more years.

Among the white respondents, two-thirds resided in "all-white" neighborhoods. Slightly less than 60% of the Negro respondents resided in predominantly Negro neighborhoods, and a little less than 40% in "mostly-white" neighborhoods. Five percent resided in "all-Negro" neighborhoods.

White collar occupations were predominant in the families of white respondents, blue collar occupations in the families of Negro respondents. Negro women were gainfully employed outside the home in just about twice the proportion of white women.

In comparing gainful occupations of persons under 35 with those over 50 years of age, there is a noticeable shift from blue collar to clerical and professional occupations among white respondents. Among Negro respondents, the principal shift is from unskilled to semi-skilled and skilled occupations within the blue collar group, also with a slight increase in the professional occupations.

The total family income of white respondents was greater, on the average, than that of Negro respondents. Also, annual incomes of Negro families *on the same occupational level* were usually less than those of white families, particularly in the white collar occupations. Thus 65% of the white as compared with 46% of the Negro families wherein the principal wage-earners were professional had annual incomes in excess of $7,500—this in spite of the fact that Negro families more frequently than white families had several adults gainfully employed.

Formal education of the white respondents, on the average, exceeded that of the Negro respondents, even though the latter group was more heavily weighted with persons engaged in white collar occupations. Among the white respondents, husbands tended to be better educated than the wives, whereas among Negro respondents, the formal education of husbands and wives tended to be about the same. Although Negro respondents under 35 years of age tended to be better educated than those over 50, there was a substantial gap in educational attainment between Negro and white respondents even in the younger age group.

There was no apparent tendency for Negro respondents to be downgraded in their pursuit of professional occupations if they had graduated from college and professional schools. However, white respondents with only a grammar school education tended to be up-graded in the types of occupations they followed compared with Negro respondents having similar education.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the Spring of 1959 the Connecticut Commission on Civil Rights approved a research project designed to study "the effect, if any, in the Negro and white communities of Connecticut of the drive to achieve school desegregation in the South." In the five years since the United States Supreme Court declared racial segregation in public schools unconstitutional (May 17, 1954) many members of both races, North and South, have become aroused over the manifest intent to thwart the implementation of the Court's decision in certain areas of the South. From impressions received in the state, Commission staff members felt the increased racial tensions in the South warranted an investigation of possible effects on Negro-white relations in Connecticut. Implicit in the Commission's decision to launch the inquiry is the recognition that mounting racial tension and conflict elsewhere may be exerting some pressure on the resolution of interracial problems within the state. The Commission has broad statutory authority "to study the problems of discrimination *in all or specific fields of human relationships,*" in addition to its more specific powers to conciliate complaints involving discrimination in employment, public accommodations, public housing, and certain aspects of private housing.[1]

Connecticut's record of activities designed to give Negroes equality with whites spans more than a century. Prior to the Civil War, the abolitionist movement had many supporters in Connecticut. Soon after the Civil War, the state legislature desegregated all public schools. The state constitution was amended in 1876 to eliminate the requirement that voters be white. In 1905 the first public accommodations law declared illegal racial discrimination in hotels, restaurants, transportation facilities, and places of amusement. In 1936, discrimination in employment in the state service was outlawed. In 1943 the state Inter-racial Commission was created, and the Governor was authorized to appoint ten Commissioners with powers to investigate employment opportunities, violations of civil liberties, and related matters. In 1947, a Fair Employment Practices Act empowered the Inter-racial Commission to proceed against employers, employment agencies, or unions who engaged in discriminatory practices based on race, religion, or national origin. Discrimination in public housing projects was declared illegal in 1949. In 1951 the legislature changed the name of the agency to the Commission on Civil Rights, to make clear that the Commission was not concerned exclusively with discrimination based on race or color. In 1953 the Public Accommodations Act was extended to cover all establishments offering goods or services to the public. And again the legislature, in 1959, extended the Public Accommodations Act into the area of private housing prohibiting discrimination in the sale or rental of a housing accommodation which was one of five or more contiguous units under the control of one owner or agent. In 1961 the legislature extended the coverage to three or more units.

The cumulative record of Connecticut civil rights legislation in the area of race relations probably represents a maximum of progress toward

---

1. General Statutes of Connecticut, 1958 Revision as amended: Ch. 563, Title 31, Sec. 122-127; Ch. 931, Title 53, Sec. 35-36.

equal opportunity between whites and Negroes achieved by any of the Northern states. The issues of school desegregation and voting rights, which are paramount in the struggle for Negro rights in the deep South today, were resolved in Connecticut within a decade after the close of the Civil War. However, eight decades were to elapse before Connecticut and some other Northern states launched programs designed to eliminate discrimination in employment and housing. The resolution of these problems so basic to the Negroes' standard of living, remains a major goal of the Connecticut Civil Rights Commission as we approach the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Though rarely stated in explicit terms, there would probably be little disagreement that the ultimate aim of non-discriminatory legislation is to facilitate the integration of the Negro in the total community. In Connecticut, the efforts to achieve this goal have been piecemeal and gradual from the passage of the School Desegregation Law in 1868 to the Private Housing Law of 1959. In spite of the real gains that have been made in reducing or eliminating discrimination against Negroes in specific areas of activity, the fact remains that a gulf separates the Negro from the white community. Though the Negro has attained the right to attend integrated schools, to vote, to circulate freely in places of public accommodation, to enjoy equal job opportunity, and to compete equally in the housing market, it still does not add up to total integration in the sense that he is free to participate with whites in all phases of community life according to mutually determined choices. Symptoms of this appear in the resistances to integration which emerge in the fields of public and private housing when the proportion of Negro families in the neighborhood increases beyond 25-30%. Also, integration seems to be limited or virtually non-existent in much of the private organizational and social life of the community with the possible exception of those organizations specifically committed to inter-group activities. Outstanding deviations in individual cases merely tend to reinforce the rule.

The Research Problem

The Commission's decision to study the possible effect of the Southern school desegregation drive on race relations in Connecticut immediately raised the problem of how to conduct the study. In preliminary talks, Negro and white leaders in the state seemed to agree that recent events in the South had heightened feelings of race consciousness within the leadership element of the Negro community and perhaps within the liberal element of the white community. On the other hand, there was considerable uncertainty as to what the effect had been among the general public both whites and Negroes. Direct interviews with respondents in all segments of the Negro and white communities would fill this gap in our knowledge, and provide an objective basis for ascertaining what both whites and Negroes aspired to or feared in the way of integration.

The questions asked of a cross-section of whites and Negroes would have to be relevant, precise, understandable, and relatively free from the possibility of misinterpretation. It seemed that the most desirable way to achieve this result would be to focus the attention of the respondent on the concept of *racial integration,* both in its general and specific mani-

festations in Connecticut. This approach would provide the respondent with a succinct point of reference for orienting his feelings concerning race relations, and could yield a valuable body of data on prevailing attitudes toward racial integration in the state.

Because of a reasonable skepticism prevailing among social scientists with regard to the relationship between attitudes and actions[2] (of which we shall have more to say later), an additional dimension was incorporated in our research design which would determine the frequency and types of actual *interracial contacts* of white and Negro respondents. Since our study was designed to elicit attitudes about integration in a wide range of situations, it seemed desirable to examine the relationship between the attitudes and the interracial practices of the respondent.

It seemed that our approach would serve the two-fold purpose of (a) determining the attitudes *and* practices of whites and Negroes with respect to racial integration in Connecticut, and (b) determining the impact of the Southern school desegregation drive on such attitudes and practices, which in fact constitute the sum total of race relations in the state.

The findings could yield results that have both immediate and long-term values. One immediate practical value would be a better understanding of the type of opposition that might emerge from the extension of the Public Accommodations Act into the field of private residential housing. For example, what types of white persons, in what areas, and of what income and occupational levels are most opposed to private residential integration? In fact, following the pattern of previous studies prepared by the Research Division, the study could be expected to yield considerable descriptive data on many of the socio-economic characteristics of the white and Negro population residing in the metropolitan areas of the state, data which in turn could be used for cross-analysis with the interracial attitudes and practices of the respondents. A broader, long-term value provided by the findings would be the basis for evaluating the direction in which racial integration is moving in the state.

The Research Procedure

Since we planned to interview both Negro and white respondents, our initial step was to select the communities in the state that would yield a representative cross-section of Negro respondents. In Connecticut, as in many other Northern states, the Negro is primarily an urban person. Therefore, on the basis of the known population concentration of Negroes, we selected six metropolitan areas—Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven, New London, Stamford, and Waterbury—from which we chose samples of both Negro and white respondents. According to the 1950 U. S. Census, these six areas include 85% of the total Negro population, and 63% of the total white population.

The Sample

We decided to interview at least 1,000 respondents, about equally di-

2. See Saenger, Gerhart, *The Social Psychology of Prejudice*, N.Y., Harpers, 1953, pp. 237-239; also, La Piere, R.T., "Attitudes vs. Actions" in *Journal of Social Forces*, Dec., 1934, pp. 230-237.

vided between Negroes and whites. It seemed that 500 cases in each racial group would permit us sufficient latitude in analyzing the data according to characteristics such as education, income, occupation, etc.

Numerically, our Negro sample was designed to include respondents selected on a basis roughly proportionate to the Negro population in each of the six metropolitan areas. Hence, our sample was more heavily weighted with respondents in Bridgeport, Hartford, and New Haven, than in New London, Stamford, and Waterbury. Although our interviewers were instructed to select Negro respondents from all strata of the population and from all types of neighborhoods, they were also instructed to be certain to interview a substantial number of Negroes in the white collar occupations (professional, managerial, and clerical), even though interviews in this category might be disproportionate to their weight in the Negro population. Our purpose, in this regard, was not necessarily to achieve representativeness of the entire Negro population as much as to have a sufficient number of cases in various categories of the population that would permit valid comparisons with whites.

Our white respondents were selected from the same metropolitan areas as the Negroes, and the number of cases from each area was roughly proportionate to the number of Negro respondents. Since about 40% of the state's white population resides in the smaller cities and towns outside the metropolitan areas, the white sample also cannot be considered representative of the entire white population. Within each metropolitan area we made a particular effort to see that the white sample included a substantial proportion of cases from the suburban communities. We felt it necessary to ascertain the attitudes of whites in such areas because it would be these communities during the next decade that would probably experience the greater impact of residential integration though relatively lacking such integration at the present time.

Overall, our sample was designed more for the purpose of making interracial comparisons of various strata or segments of the white and Negro population in the metropolitan areas rather than to arrive at findings that would be representative of the entire white and Negro population of the state.

The Schedule

The schedule of questions as finally administered in the six metropolitan areas was designed to elicit information of three basic types, consistent with the stated research problem: (1) attitudes toward racial integration, (2) practices in racial integration, and (3) the effect of the Southern school desegregation drive on such attitudes and practices.

As a preliminary question, each respondent was asked, "Would you say that during the past five years relations between whites and Negroes in Connecticut have improved a lot, improved a little, stayed the same, grown a little worse, or grown a lot worse?" He was then asked to give specific examples of areas that had "shown improvement" or "grown worse."

With regard to the area of *racial integration attitudes,* the respondent was asked initially to give his own version of what he understood to be

the meaning of racial integration. The general concept was then defined for him as meaning "white and colored people taking part together, without regard to race, in everythng that goes on in the community," and he was queried as to whether he considered this desirable or not. The general concept was then described in terms of 14 separate situations: employment, public housing, parks and recreation areas, parties, hotels, restaurants, swimming pools and beaches, private residential neighborhoods, private and parochial schools, apartment houses, public schools, social clubs and lodges, fraternities and sororities, and churches, and he was asked whether (1) he favored integration, or (2) merely accepted it without encouraging it, or (3) opposed integration in each type of situation. The section was concluded with questions on whether the respondent thought integration had increased or decreased in Connecticut during the past five years.

With regard to the area of *racial integration practices,* the respondent was asked to enumerate the different types of situations, if any, in which he had the opportunity to meet and talk with members of the other race; the relative frequency of such contacts; and the changes in frequency that had occurred during the preceding five years. White respondents who expressed the opinion that there should be more interracial contacts were then asked whether they had engaged in any, or all, of the following activities: "Starting a conversation with a Negro," "Going to a public meeting where there would be many Negroes," "Joining a club or organization with a racially mixed membership," "Inviting a Negro to your home," and "Accepting an invitation from a Negro." Negroes were asked a similar question with respect to contacts with whites.

With regard to the *effect of the Southern school desegregation drive,* the respondent was first asked whether he thought the U. S. Supreme Court did the right thing in declaring public school segregation unconstitutional in 1954. He was then asked if Southern whites and Negroes were, or were not, handling themselves well in dealing with the problems which arose over the implementation of the Court's decision. This was followed with a question as to whether he felt that the conflict over desegregation in the South was having (1) a lot of effect, or (2) some effect, or (3) practically no effect on relations between whites and Negroes in Connecticut. He was asked to specify what the effect had been if he gave an affirmative answer. The interview was concluded with a general question on what the respondent felt that people in Connecticut could do to improve race relations within their state.

The Interviewers

The schedules were administered by interviewers who were trained and supervised by staff members of the Commission's Research Division. This corps of interviewers included a nucleus of paid workers, and volunteers recruited from civic and human relations agencies located in the several metropolitan areas. The interviewers, whether paid or volunteer, were given identical briefing and operated under a common set of written instructions. A basic rule followed throughout was that white respondents were to be interviewed by whites, and Negro respondents by Negroes. This seemed imperative because both white and Negro respondents

were asked very pointed and direct questions concerning their feelings about integration with members of the other race. Such questions could prove a source of embarrassment, and perhaps avoidance, by respondents in both racial groups who had prejudicial feelings toward the other race. And obviously, our purpose was to determine, as accurately as possible, the true feelings of all respondents, whether white or Negro, prejudiced or unprejudiced.

All of the data gathered in the schedules were coded and processed by the staff of the Research Division, utilizing mechanical tabulation facilities operated by the state government.

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Preliminary to our analysis of attitudes and practices in racial integration in Connecticut we offer, in this chapter, a run-down of selected characteristics of the white and Negro respondents. These characteristics will serve throughout the study as points of reference for measuring the variations in interracial behavior. The data are derived from completed interviews of 556 white and 527 Negro respondents. In all, only about 1% of interviews were refused on the basis of disagreement with the racial character of our inquiry. Our interviewers reported a larger percentage of refusals from housewives who for one reason or another did not have the time to spare at the time they were approached. Such refusals occurred prior to their knowledge of the nature and scope of our inquiry.

Age: On the whole, the Negro respondents constituted a "younger" population than the whites. Although a little more than a third of the respondents in both racial groups were less than 35 years of age, more Negroes than whites were found in the middle group, e.g., between 35 and 50, and fewer Negroes than whites were over 50 years of age. (Table 1).

Sex: About three-fourths of the white, and two-thirds of the Negro respondents were women. Home interviewing during the work day accounted for the excess of female respondents. (Table 1).

Place of birth: Almost half of the white, compared with only one-fourth of the Negro respondents were born in Connecticut. The majority of Negro respondents were born in the South—about equally divided between the deep South (Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina) and other Southern states. (Table 1).

Table 1

AGE, SEX, AND BIRTHPLACE

	RESPONDENTS: White (556)	Negro (527)
AGE:		
Under 35	37%	36%
35-50	35	46
Over 50	28	18
SEX:		
Male	24%	31%
Female	76	69
STATE OF BIRTH:		
Connecticut	46%	26%
Other N. Eng. & Mid-Atlantic States	34	13
*Deep South	—	27
Other South	1	28
Other	19	6

*Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina.

Place of Residence (Metropolitan Area): The largest proportion of respondents of both races was interviewed in the Hartford metropolitan area, which has the highest concentration of Negro families in Connecticut. The three areas, Hartford, New Haven and Bridgeport, accounted for more than three-fourths of all interviews. The remaining twenty-five

percent were drawn from the Stamford, Waterbury, and New London areas. Each of these areas includes a central city and suburban communities. About three-tenths of the white interviews, compared with less than one-fifth of the Negro interviews, were obtained in the suburban areas. The excess of white over Negro suburban interviews was deliberate in order to achieve a more adequate sample of suburban white attitudes. (Table 2).

Length of Residence in Connecticut: About two-fifths of the Negro, compared with one-fourth of the white respondents had resided in Connecticut less than 15 years. Although this differential is understandable in the light of the migration of Negroes from the South since World War II, it is worth noting that a very substantial proportion (38%) of the Negro respondents had resided in Connecticut anywhere from 15 to 34 years, and one-fourth of the total had actually lived in the state for 35 or more years. These respondents, therefore, may be considered to represent a relatively stable Negro population. (Table 2).

Table 2

PLACE OF RESIDENCE, AND LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN CONNECTICUT

	RESPONDENTS: White (556)	Negro (527)
METROPOLITAN AREA:	32%	43%
Hartford	22	20
New Haven	21	16
Bridgeport	15	2
Stamford	3	11
Waterbury	7	8
New London		
CENTRAL CITY OR SUBURBAN:	71%	82%
Central City	29	18
Suburban		
LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN CONNECTICUT	26%	38%
Under 15 years	35	38
15-34 years	39	24
35 or more years		

Table 3

TYPE OF HOME, AND NEIGHBORHOOD

	RESPONDENTS: White (556)	Negro (527)
TYPE OF HOME:	61%	37%
Single house	28	42
Multiple dwelling unit	9	19
Apartment	2	2
Public housing		
HOME OWNERSHIP:	64%	44%
Own	36	56
Rent		
TYPE OF NEIGHBORHOOD:	67%	—%
All-white	29	38
Mostly-white	4	57
Mostly-Negro	—	5
All-Negro		

Type of Home: About 60% of the white, compared with slightly less than 40% of the Negro respondents were living in single houses. The remainder lived in multiple dwelling units, apartment houses, or public housing projects. (Table 3).

Home Ownership: More than 60% of the white, and more than 40% of the Negro respondents said that they owned their homes. (Table 3).

Type of Neighborhood: Two-thirds of the white respondents lived in "all-white" neighborhoods. Most of the others lived in neighborhoods described as "mostly-white," with the exception of 4% who lived in predominantly Negro neighborhoods. The majority of the Negro respondents (57%) resided in predominantly Negro neighborhoods. About 40% were in "mostly-white" neighborhoods, and only 5% resided in "all-Negro" neighborhoods. (Table 3).

Occupation: Each respondent was queried on his own occupation as well as that of the husband or wife. The replies were subsequently classified into broad occupational categories comparable to those used in the 1950 U. S. Census. White collar occupations included (1) *professional* (teacher, minister, lawyer, nurse, physician, etc.), (2) *proprietary and managerial* (owner, executive, manager, etc.), and (3) *clerical* (salesman, typist, stenographer, etc.). Blue collar occupations included (4) *skilled* (electrician, carpenter, plumber, etc.), (5) *semi-skilled* (machine operator, truck-driver, practical nurse, etc.), and (6) *unskilled* (laborer, domestic servant, etc.).

Three-fifths of the white and three-tenths of the Negro respondents were listed as housewives since they were not gainfully employed outside the home. (Table 4-A). The smaller proportion of Negro housewives results directly from the lower economic status of the Negro family which creates the need for gainful employment by more than one member of the family, even if only on a part-time basis. In addition, a higher incidence of broken homes among Negroes[3] frequently forces the mother into seeking gainful employment. Among the white respondents, the larger proportion of housewives cannot be accounted for in terms of an excess of female respondents. (Table 1).

For the purpose of securing a distribution that would reflect the occupational status of families, we combined the occupations of the respondents, who were gainfully employed, with those of their spouses (in those cases where the respondents were housewives). The resultant distribution revealed that two-thirds of the white, and slightly more than four-tenths of the Negro families were in the "white-collar" category. White families were more predominant in the professional, proprietary and managerial occupations, and Negro families exceeded the whites in the semi-skilled and unskilled categories. However, it should be noted that substantial proportions of the Negro families were engaged in professional (20%) and clerical (19%) occupations. (Table 4-C).

---

3. Stetler, Henry G., *Comparative Study of Negro and White Dropouts in Selected Connecticut High Schools,* Hartford, Commission on Civil Rights, 1959, p. 21.

Table 4

OCCUPATION

	RESPONDENTS: White	Negro
A. OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENT:	(528)	(498)
White Collar	27%	34%
Professional	12	15
Proprietary, managerial	5	4
Clerical	10	15
Blue Collar	12%	37%
Skilled	5	7
Semi-skilled	4	14
Unskilled	3	16
Housewives	61%	29%
B. OCCUPATION OF SPOUSE:	(439)	(347)
White Collar	55%	28%
Professional	24	13
Proprietary, managerial	15	3
Clerical	16	12
Blue Collar	29%	56%
Skilled	18	15
Semi-skilled	8	20
Unskilled	3	21
Housewives	16%	16%
C. OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENT OR SPOUSE:	(461)	(460)
White Collar	67%	44%
Professional	31	20
Proprietary, managerial	15	5
Clerical	21	19
Blue Collar	33%	56%
Skilled	17	13
Semi-skilled	11	20
Unskilled	5	23

The distribution of occupations coincided very closely with a similar distribution derived by rating the *principal* occupation in the family on a scale having unskilled occupations at the lowest level and professional occupations on the highest level. When referred to elsewhere in this study, *principal* occupation can be regarded as an accurate reflection of the occupational status of the white and Negro families included in our sample. The extent to which the distribution coincides with the entire white and Negro population in the metropolitan areas must await publication of the 1960 U. S. Census data on occupations.

Occupation by Age: Upward occupational shifts are noticeable among younger persons in both racial groups. (Table 5). If we compare persons over 50 years of age with those under 35, and 35-50, we find substantial increases in the proportion of younger white respondents making their living at professional or clerical pursuits. Older persons, of course, predominate in the proprietary or managerial categories because such pursuits are often contingent on the accumulation of economic resources, or promotion from positions of lesser responsibility. Among younger Negro respondents, the most noticeable shift is into the skilled trades, and away from unskilled jobs. (Table 5). A fairly substantial shift occurs on the level of professional jobs. However, no significant shift occurs on the clerical level, possibly because of the lesser educational qualifications (characteristic of more older workers) demanded by many clerical and

sales jobs. The lack of any change, according to age, in the proportion of proprietary and managerial occupations reflects most emphatically the (1) disadvantages suffered by Negroes in not possessing sufficient economic resources for business ownership, and (2) the difficulties experienced by Negroes in being advanced to posts of executive or managerial responsibility.

Table 5

OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENT OR SPOUSE, BY AGE

	Total	Under 35	35-50	Over 50
	White Respondents			
	(489)	(179)	(183)	(127)
White Collar	66%	68%	71%	55%
Professional	30	35	34	17
Proprietary; managerial	16	8	19	24
Clerical	20	25	18	14
Blue Collar	34%	32%	29%	45%
Skilled	19	18	15	26
Semi-skilled	10	11	10	11
Unskilled	5	3	4	8
	Negro Respondents			
	(458)	(166)	(228)	(64)
White Collar	43%	42%	45%	36%
Professional	19	19	21	14
Proprietary; managerial	5	4	5	5
Clerical	19	19	19	17
Blue Collar	57%	58%	55%	64%
Skilled	14	17	14	6
Semi-skilled	20	23	17	25
Unskilled	23	18	24	33

Total Family Income: Each respondent was asked to give an estimate of the *total* annual income of the family by checking one of six different income categories ranging from "under $1,000" to "$10,000 and over." About 11% of the white, and 14% of the Negro respondents either refused this information or professed lack of knowledge of the amount. The incomes of those who responded to the question have been grouped into categories of "Under $5,000," "$5,000-$7,500," and "Over $7,500." (Table 6).

Table 6

TOTAL FAMILY INCOME

	White	Negro
	(493)	(455)
Under $5,000 annually	33%	47%
$5,000 - $7,500	30	31
Over $7,500	37	22
$7,500 - $10,000	14	14
Over $10,000	23	8

A third of the white families and almost half of the Negro families claimed annual incomes of less than $5,000. More than one-third of the white families and about one-fifth of the Negro families estimated that their incomes were more than $7,500. In fact, the majority of whites in this category had incomes in excess of $10,000 annually.

These annual income estimates, of course, do not give a true picture of the comparative economic position of white and Negro families. Even though the Negro family reinforces its economic position by multiple job-holding, it still lacks in many instances the accumulated property and other economic resources of many white families.

Family Income and Occupation: Annual income is correlated with gainful occupation, and we would expect to find that white collar occupations, in general, yield higher incomes than blue collar occupations; that within the white collar category, professional pursuits yield higher incomes than clerical jobs; and that within the blue collar category, skilled jobs yield more than unskilled jobs. However, a comparative examination of white and Negro incomes *within each occupational level* reveals some striking differences. Even though a substantial proportion of Negro families have moved upward in the occupational hierarchy, Negro incomes *within* the occupational levels frequently lag behind those of whites on the same level. (Table 7). One-fifth of the white families in white collar occupations had incomes of less than $5,000, and more than half in excess of $7,500. On the other hand, one-third of the Negro families were in the lower income group, and only one-third in the upper group. The difference was accounted for principally by the racial variation in incomes derived from the professional occupations. Only 13% of the white professional families had incomes of less than $5,000, compared with 26% of the Negro professionals. However, 65% of the white, but only 46% of the Negro professional families had incomes in excess of $7,500. These racial differences in income on each occupational level seem all the more significant in the light of greater multiple job-holding in the Negro family. On only one level—the semi-skilled—did the Negro incomes show an advantage in comparison with the whites.

Table 7

OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENT OR SPOUSE, BY TOTAL FAMILY INCOME

	Total		Family Income: Under 5,000	5,000-7,500	Over 7,500
			White Respondents		
White Collar	294	(100%)	21%	26%	53%
Professional	137	(100%)	13	22	65
Proprietary; managerial	69	(100%)	23	18	59
Clerical	88	(100%)	30	40	30
Blue Collar	148	(100%)	49%	41%	10%
Skilled	84	(100%)	45	41	14
Semi-skilled	44	(100%)	54	41	5
Unskilled	20	(100%)	55	40	5
			Negro Respondents		
White Collar	188	(100%)	32%	32%	36%
Professional	84	(100%)	26	28	46
Proprietary; managerial	22	(100%)	27	23	50
Clerical	82	(100%)	40	38	22
Blue Collar	228	(100%)	53%	34%	13%
Skilled	56	(100%)	41	43	16
Semi-skilled	79	(100%)	40	38	22
Unskilled	93	(100%)	70	26	4

Education: The maximum amount of formal education of the respondent and spouse was checked in one of the following categories on the schedule: (1) Grades 1-8; (2) attendance (but not graduation) at high or trade school; (3) graduation from high or trade school; (4) attendance (but not graduation) at college; (5) graduation from college; and (6) graduation from professional school. For purposes of analysis, these were then grouped into three broad levels of educational attainment. (Table 8). The lowest level included those persons who had attended grammar school, or had had one to three years of high school. The intermediate level included those who had graduated from high or trade school, or had had one to three years of college. The upper group included those who had graduated from college or professional school. About half of the respondents, both white and Negro, had graduated from high or trade school or had some college education. On the other hand a larger proportion of Negroes than whites had not graduated from high school, and a larger proportion of whites than Negroes had graduated from college or professional school. White spouses were generally better educated than the respondents; whereas the educational attainments of Negro respondents and their spouses were remarkably similar. In this connection, we must bear in mind that the spouse's education was in all cases reported by the respondent, and not directly by the husband or wife of the respondent.

Any interpretation of our data on educational attainment must take into account the fact that more than half of our Negro respondents were born in Southern states, 27% in the deep South, and 28% in other Southern states. In these states many of the segregated schools provide training of an inferior quality, and more than half of our Negro respondents who were born in the deep South had received no more than a grammar school education.

Table 8
EDUCATION

	RESPONDENTS: White (553)	Negro (523)
EDUCATION OF RESPONDENT:		
Grammar School, or some High School	26%	33%
Grades 1-8	13	14
High School attended (1-3 years)	13	19
H. S. grad.; T. S. grad.; or some College	48	50
High school graduate	28	28
Trade school graduate	6	6
College attended (1-3 years)	14	16
College or Professional School graduate	26	17
College graduate	18	7
Professional school graduate	8	10
EDUCATION OF SPOUSE:	(426)	(328)
Grammar School, or some High School	22%	35%
Grades 1-8	12	13
High school attended (1-3 years)	10	22
H. S. grad.; T. S. grad.; or some College	43	48
High school graduate	26	33
Trade school graduate	7	7
College attended (1-3 years)	10	8
College or Professional School graduate	35	17
College graduate	22	8
Professional school graduate	13	9

Education and Age: Younger respondents of both races show a progressive increase in educational attainments in comparison with respondents over 50 years of age. (Table 9).

Table 9

EDUCATION, BY AGE

	Under 35	35-50	Over 50
	White Respondents		
	(204)	(193)	(154)
Grammar School or some High Sch.	17%	20%	46%
H. S. grad.; T. S. grad.; or some College	55	49	36
College or Professional School graduate	28	31	18
	Negro Respondents		
	(184)	(237)	(87)
Grammar School or some High Sch.	33%	26%	53%
H. S. grad.; T. S. grad.; or some College	48	57	36
College or Professional School graduate	19	17	11

Although a real difference between the races would probably still prevail if our white sample were more representative of the white population, the observable gains being made by Negroes in closing the educational gap will eventually lead toward better jobs, a higher standard of living, more interracial understanding, and eventually more racial integration.

Education and Occupation: The importance of education as a prerequisite for occupational advancement is dramatically illustrated when we examine the types of jobs held by respondents of varying educational backgrounds. (Table 10). Both among whites and Negroes, there is a positive correlation between educational and occupational levels. Although the correlation is slightly more pronounced among whites than Negroes (e.g., only 13% of Negroes with a grammar school education held white collar jobs, compared with 33% of the whites), it is encouraging to observe that 97% of the Negroes with a college education did hold white collar jobs, compared with 100% of the whites with similar education. The significance of this for the Negro population should be emphasized because of the repeated rumors to the effect that educated Negroes are frequently forced to work at semi-skilled or even unskilled jobs because of racial discrimination. Our data on types of jobs held by Negroes, as reported by themselves, indicates that Connecticut is moving ahead in providing fair employment opportunities, commensurate with abilities, for its Negro population.

Table 10

OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENT OR SPOUSE, BY EDUCATION

	Grammar Sch. or some High School	H.S. grad., T. S. grad. or some College	College or Prof. Sch. Graduate
	White Respondents		
	(97)	(188)	(176)
White Collar	33%	53%	100%
Professional	—	8	72
Proprietary; managerial	14	18	13
Clerical	19	27	15
Blue Collar	67%	47%	—%
Skilled	20	32	—
Semi-skilled	34	10	—
Unskilled	13	5	—
	Negro Respondents		
	(140)	(234)	(86)
White Collar	13%	42%	97%
Professional	1	8	81
Proprietary; managerial	3	6	5
Clerical	9	28	11
Blue Collar	87%	58%	3%
Skilled	15	17	1
Semi-skilled	21	26	1
Unskilled	51	15	1

Religion: Our Negro respondents were chiefly Protestant (87%), with 10% of the Catholic faith. Among the white respondents, 43% were Catholic, 37% Protestant, and 16% Jewish. (Table 11).

Table 11

RELIGION

	RESPONDENTS: White (555)	Negro (521)
Catholic	43%	10%
Protestant	37	87
Jewish	16	—
Other or none	4	3

In succeeding chapters we shall seek to discover relationships between characteristics such as education, occupation, income, type of neighborhood, etc., and the interracial attitudes and practices of our white and Negro respondents.

III. IMPACT OF SOUTHERN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION DRIVE IN CONNECTICUT

Between the announcement of the U.S. Supreme Court decision on school desegregation in May 1954, and the launching of our inquiry in 1959, efforts to implement the Court's decision had been effective in only about one-third of the bi-racial school districts of 18 Southern states.[4] While many of these districts had been desegregated with relatively little publicity, opposition involving overt conflict, as in Little Rock, Arkansas, had increased tension between the races and excited feelings both pro and con among many persons including those not directly involved in the immediate situations. The prospect of what might follow a showdown in the districts of the deep Southern states (none of which had been desegregated) also heightened consciousness of the problem.

Against a background of conflict over fundamental human rights, that had assumed national and international proportions, it seemed appropriate, and, in fact, quite necessary to ascertain what effect such events may have had on the thoughts and actions of our own citizens. Just recently Harry S. Ashmore declared that "the struggle in the South will go on for a long time but it already has become a footnote to our national history. It is outside the South that we now see the most meaningful consequences of the collision between the accelerating Negro crusade for equality and a resistant status quo. *It is here that we must look* for the resolution our times so urgently demand." (Italics ours).[5]

Because more than half of our Negro citizens were born in the South, close kinship ties combined with a complex of social and psychological factors inevitably result in a close identification with the problems of Southern Negroes. This heightened racial awareness could understandably accelerate demands for fuller racial equality in our own state. Our white citizens, few of whom were born in the South, could scarcely avoid the pressure of these events. Some might find reason to reinforce or even change their beliefs, while others who never gave much thought to the matter might be moved to take at least some position on the question of their relations with members of the Negro community.

Details concerning the respective positions of our own white and Negro citizens on questions of interracial concern in Connecticut will be presented in later chapters. First, we shall examine the feelings of Connecticut citizens with regard to the overall impact of the Southern desegregation drive.

After reading to our respondents the statement, "Since the U. S. Supreme Court ruled in 1954 that the Southern system of having separate public schools for Negroes was unconstitutional, we have heard a lot about what has happened in Little Rock and other parts of the South," we asked them whether they thought the Supreme Court "did the right thing." Three-fourths of our white and more than nine-tenths of our Negro respondents gave an affirmative answer. (Table 12). Most of the negative and "don't know" replies came from respondents, in both racial

4. "Report Card on Desegregation", Saturday Review, May 23, 1959.
5. Ashmore, Harry S., *The Other Side of Jordan*, N.Y., W. W. Norton, 1960.

groups, with less than a high school education. The correlation between extent of formal education and favorable interracial attitudes will recur quite frequently throughout the course of our analysis. Younger white respondents (under 35), and whites whose family income exceeded $7,500 annually also favored the Supreme Court decision more frequently than persons over 50, or persons with incomes of less than $5,000.

Table 12

ATTITUDE TOWARD SUPREME COURT DECISION, BY EDUCATION

	Total	Grammar Sch. or some High School	H.S. grad., T.S. grad. or some College	College or Prof. Sch. Graduate
		White Respondents		
	(554)	(144)	(265)	(145)
Did Supreme Court do right thing?				
Yes	76%	58%	79%	88%
No	14	21	13	9
Don't know	10	21	8	3
		Negro Respondents		
	(523)	(175)	(261)	(87)
Yes	94%	88%	96%	98%
No	3	7	1	—
Don't know	3	5	3	2

Effect of Southern School Desegregation Drive

A majority both of whites (55%) and Negroes (65%) felt that the school desegregation drive had some effect on race relations in Connecticut. (Table 13). Negroes, more frequently than whites, felt that the effect was positive rather than negative. About a third of the respondents whether white or Negro felt that race relations in Connecticut had not been affected.

Table 13

EFFECT OF SOUTHERN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION DRIVE ON RACE RELATIONS IN CONNECTICUT

	RESPONDENTS: White (556)	Negro (527)
School desegregation drive had:	55%	65%
Some effect	42	56
Positive effect	13	9
Negative effect	32	30
No effect	13	5
Don't know		

Those white respondents who saw race relations improved by the desegregation drive gave, most frequently as results, an increased "awareness of racial problems," an increased sense of "ethical responsibility," and an "improved attitude toward Negroes." (Table 14). Negro respondents had a similar reaction, except that they placed greater emphasis on the general "improvement of attitudes" toward their race. (Table 15). Better educated respondents among both whites and Negroes usually placed greater emphasis on the positive gains than did those with less formal education.

Among the respondents who felt the conflict produced negative effects, only 13% of the whites and 9% of the Negroes, cited, most frequently as a result, an increased "hostility between whites and Negroes." Only 2% of the white respondents felt that Negroes showed an increased "aggressiveness." There was also a tendency among a small proportion of the better educated respondents to cite *both* positive and negative effects. While an ambivalent position of this sort is not unreasonable considering the many facets of the problem, the weight of evidence is decidedly in favor of a positive rather than negative impact on race relations in the state.

White respondents living in "all-white" neighborhoods had substantially the same reactions as those living in "mostly-white" neighborhoods. However, Negro respondents residing in "mostly-white" neighborhoods were more inclined toward the "positive" nature of the impact than were those who resided in "mostly-Negro" neighborhoods.

Table 14

SPECIFIC EFFECTS OF SOUTHERN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION DRIVE ON RACE RELATIONS IN CONNECTICUT, BY EDUCATION

	White Respondents			
	Total (554)	Grammar Sch. or some High School (144)	H.S. grad., T.S. grad. or some College (265)	College or Prof. Sch. Graduate (145)
SOME EFFECT	55%	40%	55%	69%
Positive effect	42	22	42	59
Improved attitude toward Negroes	7	7	5	10
Increased awareness of racial problems	12	5	12	18
Increased ethical responsibility	10	3	10	15
Greater social acceptance	1	1	0	1
More discussion of racial problems	4	2	5	7
Other	3	1	4	4
Don't know	5	3	6	4
Negative effect*	13	18	13	10
Increased hostility between whites and Negroes	11	12	10	13
Increased aggressiveness of Negroes	2	3	1	1
Other	3	3	2	1
NO EFFECT	32	39	36	19
DON'T KNOW	13	21	9	12

*The sum of negative responses exceeds the sub-group total because some respondents gave both positive and negative effects.

Table 15

SPECIFIC EFFECTS OF SOUTHERN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION DRIVE ON RACE RELATIONS IN CONNECTICUT, BY EDUCATION

	Total (523)	Negro Respondents: Grammar Sch. or some High School (175)	Negro Respondents: H.S. grad., T.S. grad. or some College (261)	Negro Respondents: College or Prof. Sch. Graduate (87)
SOME EFFECT	65%	48%	70%	85%
Positive effect	56	41	62	72
Improved attitude toward Negroes	16	14	18	15
Increased awareness of racial problems	11	5	12	19
Increased ethical responsibility	8	7	9	10
Greater social acceptance	4	3	4	6
More discussion of racial problems	6	5	6	8
Other	3	1	5	3
Don't know	8	7	8	11
Negative effect*	9	7	8	13
Increased hostility between whites and Negroes	6	4	6	11
Other	4	3	4	5
NO EFFECT	30	44	26	10
DON'T KNOW	5	8	4	5

*The sum of negative responses exceeds the sub-group total because some respondents gave both positive and negative effects.

A general improvement in race relations in Connecticut during the five-year period immediately preceding our interrogation was felt by two-thirds of the Negro, and slightly less than one-half of the white respondents. (Table 16). The question of whether race relations had "improved," "stayed the same," or "grown worse," was asked of the respondent at the very beginning of the interview before any questions were asked on the effects of the Southern desegregation drive. About one-fourth of the respondents, both white and Negro, felt that there had been no change. Only 8% of the white, and 4% of the Negro respondents felt that matters had "grown worse." While there is no provable connection between these changes in Connecticut and the Southern situation, the small proportion of negative reactions would seem to minimize any adverse influence.

Respondents who were older, or who had resided a greater length of time in the state were more inclined to feel that race relations had improved than younger, more recent residents. This was especially characteristic of Negroes where exposure to discriminatory behavior could have sensitized them to changes occurring over the years.

While large proportions of the respondents had the feeling that race relations in general had improved, they were more reluctant, or found it more difficult to identify specific areas of improvement. Employment and housing were the areas given the highest priorities both by white and Negro respondents. Housing, curiously enough, was also referred

to most frequently as an area of relations that had deteriorated. This ambivalence is understandable because housing integration is currently the leading race relations problem in Connecticut, the solution of which evokes mixed reactions as we shall discuss later in more detail.

Table 16

CHANGE IN RACE RELATIONS IN CONNECTICUT DURING PAST FIVE YEARS

		Lived in Connecticut		
	Total	Less than 15 Years	15-34 Years	35 or more Years
		White Respondents		
	(541)	(145)	(186)	(210)
Said that race relations:				
Improved	45%	33%	46%	53%
Improved a lot	16	5	20	20
Improved a little	29	28	26	33
Stayed the same	28	26	32	27
Had grown worse	8	4	10	8
Grown a little worse	6	4	7	6
Grown a lot worse	2	0	3	2
Don't know	19	37	12	12
		Negro Respondents		
	(516)	(196)	(197)	(123)
Improved	68%	52%	74%	82%
Improved a lot	24	16	27	31
Improved a little	44	36	47	51
Stayed the same	24	36	19	13
Had grown worse	4	4	5	3
Grown a little worse	4	4	4	3
Grown a lot worse	0	0	1	0
Don't know	4	8	2	2

Attitudes toward Conduct of Southern Whites and Southern Negroes in the Public School Controversy

Respondents of both races agreed more often about the conduct of Southern whites than that of Southern Negroes in the controversy over school desegregation. They were asked whether they felt that Southern whites were "conducting themselves very well, fairly well, or not well at all in handling the public school situation," followed with a similar query concerning the conduct of Southern Negroes.

Very few white or Negro respondents (only 4%) conceded that Southern whites were handling the situation "very well." (Tables 17, 18). The conduct of Southern Negroes was more highly regarded, with one-fifth of our white and one-half of our Negro respondents giving it the highest rating. A "fairly well" type of conduct was ascribed more frequently to Southern Negroes by white and Negro respondents alike. In the sense of regarding their conduct "not well at all," Southern whites were criticized more by our respondents than Southern Negroes. Forty percent of our white, and 53% of our Negro respondents regarded Southern white conduct in that light, whereas 11% of our white and only 4% of our Negro respondents so described the conduct of Southern Negroes.

Table 17

CONDUCT OF SOUTHERN WHITES IN PUBLIC SCHOOL CONTROVERSY

	White Respondents (556)	Negro Respondents (527)
Whites are conducting themselves:		
Very well	4%	3%
Fairly well	28	21
Not well at all	40	53
Some good, some bad (volunteered)	15	21
Don't know	13	2

Table 18

CONDUCT OF SOUTHERN NEGROES IN PUBLIC SCHOOL CONTROVERSY

	White Respondents (556)	Negro Respondents (527)
Negroes are conducting themselves:		
Very well	20%	51%
Fairly well	44	31
Not well at all	11	4
Some good, some bad (volunteered)	8	12
Don't know	17	2

It is worth noting at this point that among our white respondents, those having the most favorable attitudes toward racial integration in Connecticut also regarded the conduct of Southern whites least favorably, and those most prejudiced toward racial integration in Connecticut were more sympathetic toward the Southern whites' conduct. This consistency in our white respondents' attitudes will be discussed further in connection with our analysis of the "integration score" of our respondents. (See Chapter V).

IV. RACIAL INTEGRATION: GENERAL ATTITUDES

Both white and Negro respondents were very close together in their general grasp of the concept of racial integration. Three-fourths of the white, and four-fifths of the Negro respondents demonstrated a basic understanding in their reply to the question "What do the words racial integration mean to you?" (Table 19). Usually it was expressed in general terms such as "whites and Negroes getting together," and frequently included the additional qualification of "equality" between the races. Relatively few of our respondents in reply to this particular question seemed to be concerned exclusively with specific areas of interracial activity, such as employment, housing, or education. Respondents who lacked clear understanding of the concept usually defined it as "segregation," or just said that they didn't know what it meant.

The influence of formal education on the respondents' understanding of the concept is clearly demonstrated. Only half of the white respondents with a grammar school education understood it, in comparison with 95 percent of those who had a college or professional school education. (Table 20). A similar progression is noticeable among Negro respondents with the exception that a grammar school education did not seem to impose as marked a limitation as it did among the lesser educated whites.

A better understanding of the concept is also reflected within families having the higher incomes. (Table 21). With respect to the age of the respondent, there seemed to be only a slight degree of correlation between understanding of the term and the younger age of white respondents, which was absent among Negro respondents.

Table 19

UNDERSTANDING OF THE CONCEPT OF "RACIAL INTEGRATION"

	Respondents	
	White (556)	Negro (527)
Respondents who understood the concept	76%	81%
Generalized definition, characterized by equality	23	26
Generalized definition without references to equality	26	39
Defined in terms of specific areas (employment, education, etc.)	12	7
Other	15	10
Respondents who did not understand	25	19
Defined as "segregation"	4	2
Had "no meaning" to respondent	2	1
Other misconceptions	6	4
Don't know	13	12

Table 20

UNDERSTANDING OF THE CONCEPT OF "RACIAL INTEGRATION," BY EDUCATION

	Grammar Sch. or some High School	H.S. grad., T.S. grad. or some College	College or Prof. Sch. Graduate
		White Respondents	
	(144)	(265)	(145)
Respondents who understood the concept	51%	80%	95%
Respondents who did not understand	49	20	5
		Negro Respondents	
	(175)	(261)	(87)
Respondents who understood the concept	65%	86%	95%
Respondents who did not understand	35	14	5

Table 21

UNDERSTANDING OF THE CONCEPT OF "RACIAL INTEGRATION," BY TOTAL FAMILY INCOME

	Under $5,000	$5,000-7,500	Over $7,500
		White Respondents	
	(163)	(148)	(182)
Respondents who understood the concept	64%	77%	94%
Respondents who did not understand	36	23	6
		Negro Respondents	
	(213)	(141)	(101)
Respondents who understood the concept	75%	91%	90%
Respondents who did not understand	25	9	10

Although a large majority of the respondents had demonstrated a knowledge of the concept of racial integration, without direction from the interviewer, we felt before proceeding further that we should give them a definition that would clarify the term for those who misunderstood it, and also provide a common basis for all respondents to reply to more detailed questions on integration. Hence, we read the statement that "Complete integration would mean colored and white people taking part together, without regard to race, in everything that goes on in a community," and then asked them, "Do you think this would be desirable now, or that we should move toward it slowly, or do you think that this would be a bad thing?"

Negro respondents, in comparison with whites, were unequivocal in their replies. More than three-fourths of the Negroes felt that complete racial integration, as defined above was *desirable now!* Only a fifth of the whites would make a similar commitment. (Table 22).

Table 22

DESIRABILITY OF COMPLETE RACIAL INTEGRATION

	Respondents	
	White (536)	Negro (527)
Complete racial integration is:		
"Desirable now"	22%	62%
"Move slowly"	54	35
"Bad thing"	17	1
Don't know	7	2

At the other extreme, 17% of the whites felt that racial integration was a "bad thing," compared with a mere 1% of the Negro respondents.

Avoiding both extremes, either of accepting immediate integration or rejecting it outright, the majority of the white respondents felt that we should "move slowly" toward its realization. A middle position of this sort is of course subject to a diversity of interpretations ranging from one of genuine concern with gradually remolding race relations in the image of the professed democratic, ethical, and religious ideals of our culture, to the other extreme of merely stalling for time in the interest of preserving the status quo. We shall approach closer to a more objective understanding of this gradualistic position taken by many of the white respondents when we break down, in Chapter V, the concept of "complete integration" and subject its component areas of interracial activity to a more detailed analysis.

Although the highest proportion of white respondents who committed themselves to complete integration *now* are found among college and professional school graduates, it is worth noting that there is virtually no difference between the positions taken by high school graduates and those who had gone little further than grammar school. (Table 23). When we consider that the majority of whites in the total population would be in these two lesser educated categories, it would seem to follow that the white population of the state, in general, is far from being committed to complete integration at this time.

Table 23

DESIRABILITY OF COMPLETE RACIAL INTEGRATION, BY EDUCATION

	Grammar Sch. or some High School	H.S. grad., T.S. grad. or some College	College or Prof. Sch. Graduate
	White Respondents		
	(144)	(265)	(145)
Complete racial integration is:			
"Desirable now"	17%	18%	34%
"Move slowly"	41	58	60
"Bad thing"	31	16	5
Don't know	11	8	1
	Negro Respondents		
	(175)	(261)	(87)
Complete racial integration is:			
"Desirable now"	50%	64%	75%
"Move slowly"	44	33	23
"Bad thing"	2	1	0
Don't know	4	2	2

White respondents who had lived in the state less than 15 years were more favorably disposed toward integration than those who had resided here more than 35 years. However, the attitude toward complete integration showed little variation according to the age of the white respondents. The attitude of Negro respondents born in the South differed in no material respect from those born in New England or other Northern states.

Changes in Racial Integration in Connecticut During the Past Five Years

Although whites and Negroes in Connecticut are relatively far apart in their attitudes on the timing of achieving complete integration, they are much more in agreement in their evaluation of the actual changes in integration that had taken place in the state during the past five years. In this regard, they were asked, "Judging from what you see and hear about, would you say that in Connecticut during the past five years racial integration has increased, stayed about the same, or decreased?" Fifty-two percent of the white, and 62% of the Negro respondents felt that integration had increased during this period; about a third in each racial group felt that it had "stayed the same"; and only 2% felt that it had actually decreased. (Table 24). A larger proportion of whites (19%) than Negroes (5%) would not commit themselves.

Changes occurring in residential living patterns apparently influenced this evaluation because white and Negro respondents alike who were living in "mostly-white" neighborhoods were more positive that racial integration was on the increase than were white respondents living in "all-white," or Negro respondents living in "all-Negro" neighborhoods.

Table 24

CHANGE IN RACIAL INTEGRATION IN CONNECTICUT DURING PAST FIVE YEARS

	Respondents	
	White (556)	Negro (527)
Racial integration has:		
Increased	52%	62%
Stayed the same	27	30
Decreased	2	3
Don't know	19	5

Reasons for Changes in Racial Integration in Connecticut

Respondents who felt that racial integration had increased in recent years were asked, in a non-directed question, to state what they considered to be the reasons accounting for the change. Whites and Negroes were in substantial agreement in mentioning education, greater opportunities for interracial contact, and increasing job qualifications of Negroes. (Tables 25, 26). Civil rights legislation (e. g., the Fair Employment Practices Law and the Civil Rights Commission) was given high priority by Negro respondents, though a substantial proportion of whites—particularly those with a college or professional school education—also mentioned it. About 10% of the Negro respondents, compared with only one percent of the

whites, credited the NAACP as a factor contributing to the increase. White respondents (16%) seemed to be more conscious than Negro respondents (3%) of the state's growing Negro population as a factor contributing to increasing integration. While sheer growth of the number of Negroes provides a greater potential for interracial contact, it could also result in the emergence of segregation patterns if mobility in residential housing is restricted. Although Connecticut had gone far in the areas of public school and job integration, any lag in free access to residential integration could serve to slow down integration.

Table 25

REASONS FOR INCREASE IN RACIAL INTEGRATION IN CONNECTICUT DURING PAST FIVE YEARS, BY EDUCATION

		White Respondents		
	Total	Grammar Sch. or some High School	H.S. grad., T.S. grad., or some College	College or Prof. Sch. Graduate
	(289)	(71)	(139)	(79)
Racial integration increased because of:				
Education	16%	9%	14%	28%
Civil rights legislation (FEP, Civil Rights Comm., etc.,)	14	6	14	22
NAACP	1	0	1	3
Radio, TV, newspapers, magazines, etc.	5	1	5	6
More opportunities for contact, mutual interests, etc.	25	25	25	25
Increasing job qualifications, economic status, etc.	17	14	19	15
Increasing Negro population	16	20	17	10
Other	15	20	13	13
Don't know	11	18	9	8

NOTE: Percentages exceed 100 because of multiple answers.

Table 26

REASONS FOR INCREASE IN RACIAL INTEGRATION IN CONNECTICUT DURING PAST FIVE YEARS, BY EDUCATION

	Total	Negro Respondents: Grammar Sch. or some High School	H.S. grad., T.S. grad., or some College	College or Prof. Sch. Graduate
	(322)	(90)	(164)	(68)
Racial integration increased because of:				
Education	19%	19%	20%	18%
Civil rights legislation (FEP, Civil Rights Comm., etc.)	24	14	25	32
NAACP	11	7	13	9
Radio, TV, newspapers, magazines, etc.	6	0	9	7
More opportunities for contact, mutual interests, etc.	24	38	7	46
Increasing job qualifications, economic status, etc.	19	22	17	22
Increasing Negro population	3	0	4	4
Other	10	9	10	9
Don't know	10	16	9	4

NOTE: Percentages exceed 100 because of multiple answers.

V. RACIAL INTEGRATION: SPECIFIC ATTITUDES

Inherent in any general attitude toward racial integration, whether favorable or unfavorable, may be some qualification in regard to a particular phase of interracial activity. Thus, the white proponent of complete integration might welcome one or two Negro families into his neighborhood, but would object if "too many moved in." Or even close friendships with Negroes might not prevent some doubt concerning the advisability of racial intermarriage on the grounds that community pressures could eventually create problems for the couple and their children. Likewise the white opponent of complete integration might qualify his position by making limited concessions in areas such as employment or public education.

In order to determine the variations in attitudes toward specific areas of racial integration, we followed the question on complete integration with this statement: "Sometimes people feel that whites and Negroes should take part together in some activities but not in others." After handing the respondent a card listing 14 different areas of interracial activity, the interviewer then asked, "Will you tell me about each of these, whether you *favor* white and colored mixing, or whether you *accept* it although you do not encourage it, or whether you *oppose* the races mixing."[6]

The 14 specific areas in which the respondent was asked to check one of the alternatives in each included: (a) areas in which discrimination is prohibited by law in Connecticut, such as employment, public housing projects, parks and recreation areas, hotels, restaurants, swimming pools and beaches; (b) areas partially covered by law such as private housing and apartments; and (c) areas involving no legislative control, such as private schools, churches, fraternities and sororities, social clubs and lodges, and parties. Activities in the latter areas, (c), were included solely for comparative purposes, with no implication that they should be subject to legislative control.

White respondents demonstrated a wide variation in their reactions, ranging from a high of 70% who favored racial integration in public schools to a low of 28% who favored integration in private residential neighborhoods, and at parties. (Table 27). Those whites who voiced complete opposition to integration ranged from a low of 3% in the area of public schools, to a high of 46% with respect to parties.

In areas covered by anti-discrimination legislation, whites were most favorably disposed to integration in public schools and employment. They were less favorably disposed in areas such as parks and recreation areas, restaurants, hotels, swimming pools and beaches. They were least favorably disposed toward integration in any type of housing, whether public housing projects, private apartment houses, or private residential housing.

In areas outside the realm of non-discriminatory legislation, two-thirds of the white respondents favored integration in the churches, and 60%

6. The three words, "favor, accept, and oppose," describe attitudes, and may or may not correspond with actions in interracial situations. The interracial contacts and actions of our respondents will be discussed in Chapter VI.

Table 27

ATTITUDES TOWARD SPECIFIC AREAS OF RACIAL INTEGRATION

	White Respondents (556)			
	Percent who:			
Racial integration in:	Favor	Accept	Oppose	Don't Know
*Public schools	70%	25%	3%	2%
*Employment	68	27	3	2
Churches	67	24	7	2
Private schools	60	27	9	4
*Parks and recreation areas	59	27	11	3
*Restaurants	56	30	11	3
*Hotels	51	25	19	5
*Swimming pools and beaches	43	26	26	5
Fraternities and sororities	40	22	23	15
*Public housing projects	37	26	32	5
**Apartments	37	25	31	7
Social clubs and lodges	36	25	29	10
**Private residential neighborhoods	28	29	37	6
Parties	28	20	46	6

	Negro Respondents (527)			
	Percent who:			
Racial integration in:	Favor	Accept	Oppose	Don't Know
*Employment	96%	4%	0%	0%
*Public schools	95	5	0	0
*Restaurants	94	5	1	0
*Public housing projects	94	5	0	1
**Apartments	94	5	0	1
*Parks and recreation areas	94	5	0	1
*Swimming pools and beaches	93	5	1	1
Private schools	92	6	1	1
*Hotels	92	6	1	1
Churches	91	6	2	1
**Private residential neighborhoods	90	7	2	1
Fraternities and sororities	80	12	4	4
Social clubs and lodges	77	16	5	2
Parties	63	25	9	3

*Statutory bars against discrimination.
**Statutory bars against discrimination, but limited to five or more contiguous units offered for sale or rent.

favored it in private schools, with only 9% voicing opposition. Areas involving social activities of one type or another met with the least number of favorable replies. It is worth noting that whites regarded integration in any of the housing areas with a degree of disfavor approximating that reserved for social activities.

About one-fourth of the white respondents, on the average, took the middle position of "accepting, though not encouraging" racial integration in each of the areas. In a way, these "middle-grounders" can be regarded as holding a balance of power between those who favor and those who oppose integration. In "accepting, without encouraging" integration, they are saying, in effect, that they will go along with what the community wants. Thus, if the community, either formally or informally, moves in the direction of further integration, they will go along with it,

but if the community veers in the direction of segregation, they would probably take no positive steps to prevent it. As far as these persons are concerned, the degree of interracial activity in the community will depend upon whether the initiative is assumed by persons who favor integration, or by persons who favor segregation.

Attitudes of Negro respondents with respect to these specific areas of integration differed sharply from those of whites. The proportion of Negroes who *favor* integration is significantly larger than that of whites in every area. (Table 27). In fact, there is a noticeable lack of differentiation in their attitudes toward all types of interracial activity, other than those of a purely social nature. There is only a slight difference in range between the 96% who favored integration in employment to the 90% who also favored integration in private housing. Among whites, there was a spread of 40% in this regard.

Since the overwhelming majority of Negroes favor integration in these areas, there are relatively few who "merely accept," or "oppose" such integration. Hence, there seems to be little doubt with respect to the position of Negroes in comparison with whites. Status is undoubtedly a factor affecting the reactions of both races. Whites are concerned with maintaining it in their own image, and look upon Negroes as a threat. Negroes are concerned with achieving it in the sense of gaining political, economic and social equality. However, there is also another important element involved in the Negroes' reactions. They have found, through bitter experience, that segregation in any area carries with it the stamp of inferiority. It means lower grade jobs, poorer schools, inferior housing, and second-rate public accommodations. Apart from any desire to mingle freely with whites, there is the realization that access to better things is withheld when segregation prevails. Hence, racial integration offers many advantages whether they be material, political, social or psychological.

The proportion of Negroes favoring integration was somewhat less in the areas involving social activities, such as fraternities and sororities, social clubs and lodges, and parties, though the proportion opposed to such integration was much less than that of whites. This phenomenon seems to give credence to the oft-circulated rumor that Negroes themselves "don't want integration." However, it is limited to purely social activities, whereas it is obvious that in other areas of activity, Negroes do want integration because of the equality of opportunities that follows from the application of the concept.

Among white respondents, the proportion of favorable responses in each area usually tended to increase among the better-educated, higher-income, white collar groups. As an example, we present data in Table 28 showing the relationship between formal education and the respondent's attitude toward integration in private residential neighborhoods.

Table 28

ATTITUDE TOWARD INTEGRATION IN PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS, BY EDUCATION

	White Respondents		
	Grammar Sch. or some High School (144)	H.S. grad., T.S. grad. or some College (265)	College or Prof. Sch. Graduate (145)
Favor integration	20%	22%	49%
Accept integration	23	32	27
Oppose integration	49	40	21
Don't know	8	6	3

In this connection, it seems worth noting that the attitudes of white respondents toward residential integration did not differ between those who lived in "all-white," and those who lived in "mostly-white" neighborhoods. (Table 29). The proportions who "favored" or "opposed" integration were virtually the same regardless of whether any Negro families were, or were not living in the neighborhood.

Table 29

ATTITUDE TOWARD INTEGRATION IN PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS, BY TYPE OF NEIGHBORHOOD

	White Respondents Living in:	
	All-white Neighborhood (371)	Mostly-white Neighborhood (158)
Favor integration	28%	28%
Accept integration	28	31
Oppose integration	38	37
Don't know	6	4

The findings of the present study with regard to resistance of whites to housing integration do not differ materially from findings of earlier studies prepared for the Commission on Civil Rights. For example, in 1955, in a study of integration in public housing projects, we found among white tenants living in integrated projects that 35% favored integrated projects; 30% preferred separate buildings for whites and Negroes; 27% were opposed to integrated projects; and 14% said they didn't know how they felt.[7] Again, in 1957, in a study of white families living in integrated private neighborhoods, 33% said that they approved of such integration; 32% said they approved it conditionally (comparable to the "accept, but not encourage" attitude in the present study); 29% opposed it; and 6% said they didn't know how they felt.[8] The similarity between these findings and those of the present study (Table 29) indicates a continued resistance to housing integration in the sense that only a third of the white respondents voice an unqualified attitude favorable to such integration.

7. Stetler, Henry G., *Racial Integration in Public Housing Projects in Connecticut*, Hartford, Commission on Civil Rights, 1955, Table 39, p. 54.
8. Stetler, Henry G., *Private Interracial Neighborhoods in Connecticut*, Hartford, Commission on Civil Rights, 1957, Table 48, p. 45.

Because of the undifferentiated character of favorable Negro attitudes toward integration in all areas other than those involving social activities (see Table 27), we selected one of the latter to determine whether a factor such as formal education made any difference. "Parties" represented the area of activity in which the lowest proportion (63%) of Negro respondents had expressed an attitude favorable to integration. When the responses are broken down according to the level of formal education, a trend emerges that is comparable to that of white responses. The least-educated in both racial groups are most opposed to such interracial activity, while both white and Negro college or professional school graduates give expression to favorable attitudes most frequently. (Table 30).

At the beginning of this chapter we pointed out that after each respondent had been handed a card listing 14 areas of activity he was asked to check his attitude toward racial integration in each area. After completing this task, the respondent was asked whether there were "any situations not listed on the card in which you oppose racial intermixing?" In response to this non-directed question about one-half of the white respondents and one-fifth of the Negro respondents said that they were opposed to racial intermarriage. Virtually no other situations were volunteered, largely because of the wide range of activities specifically covered in the previous question.

Table 30

ATTITUDE TOWARD INTEGRATION AT PARTIES, BY EDUCATION

	Total	Grammar Sch. or some High School	H.S. grad., T.S. grad. or some College	College or Prof. Sch. Graduate
		White Respondents		
	(554)	(144)	(265)	(145)
Favor integration	28%	11%	24%	51%
Accept integration	18	13	18	24
Oppose integration	46	63	49	23
Don't know	8	13	9	2
		Negro Respondents		
	(523)	(175)	(261)	(87)
Favor integration	63%	58%	61%	77%
Accept integration	25	21	33	14
Oppose integration	9	16	6	5
Don't know	3	5	0	4

Although these spontaneous reactions showed that whites had no monopoly on opposition to racial intermarriage, it did seem to indicate that whites were much more concerned than Negroes. In fact, it is reasonably safe to assume that a directed question to whites would have evoked an even larger proportion of unfavorable responses, based on past experience of staff workers of the Commission on Civil Rights. On frequent occasions, during the discussion period following a talk given by a Commission representative, the question of the "problem" of racial intermarriage will be raised by a white member of the audience. This fear of the consequences of racial intermarriage is undeniably present among

a majority of whites despite the fact that such marriages occur infrequently in Connecticut.[9]

The Integration Score

The integration score is a composite rating of each of our respondents based on their attitudes toward integration in each of the 14 areas of interracial activity (but not including attitudes toward intermarriage, which were volunteered). The score is derived by taking each of the specific areas (employment, restaurants, etc.) and ascribing a weight of one to a *favorable* attitude; a weight of five to an attitude of *"accept, but not encourage";* and a weight of ten to an attitude of *opposition.* Thus, if a respondent said that he favored integration in all 14 areas, he would have a composite score of 14 which would represent the lowest and most positive score that any respondent could attain. At the other extreme, if he said that he opposed integration in all 14 areas, he would have a composite score of 140 which would represent the highest and most negative score attainable. Thus, on the basis of ascribing weights within each area, the respondent could attain a composite score ranging anywhere from 14 to 140. In effect, the composite score is a hypothetical device designed to rank our respondents on a scale ranging from the most favorable (positive) to the least favorable (negative) attitudes toward integration.

The integration scores of the white respondents were then grouped into three categories of equal size: *positive* (32%), *intermediate* (34%), and *negative* (34%). (Table 31). The purpose of this grouping is to have three equally-sized cells of white cases that would (1) permit cross-tabulation with other characteristics of the white respondents, and (2) permit comparison with integration scores of Negro respondents. These groupings are not absolute in any sense, and should not lead to any inference such as one-third of the white population being in favor of integration and one-third opposed. They merely determine the position of the white respondents in relation to each other.

Table 31
INTEGRATION SCORE

	Respondents	
	White (507)	Negro (519)
Positive Score	32%	86%
14	17	56
15-29	15	30
Intermediate Score	34	13
30-44	11	8
45-59	11	2
60-74	12	3
Negative Score	34	1
75-89	12	1
90-104	10	0
105-119	8	0
120-139	3	0
140	1	0

9. Unlike most Southern states, Connecticut has no legislation against racial intermarriage. Recently, the Research Division of the Commission on Civil Rights made a special analysis of racial intermarriages in Connecticut, based on data gathered by the Public Health Statistics Section of the Connecticut State Department of Health. It found that during the 7-year period from 1953 through 1959, 285 marriages between whites and Negroes had been performed, out of a total of 124,746 marriages in the same period. This represents an average of about 40 Negro-white marriages per year, or a rate of 2.3 per thousand of all marriages. Of the Negro-white marriages, 70% had Negro, and 30% had white grooms.

The integration scores of Negro respondents are much higher than those of whites. (Table 31). For example, 86% of the Negro respondents had positive scores equivalent to those of only a third of the whites. Thirteen percent of the Negroes had intermediate scores, equivalent to another third of the whites. And only 1% of the Negro respondents had negative scores equivalent to the third of the white respondents who had the least favorable attitudes toward racial integration. This comparison confirms the wide discrepancy between the white and Negro positions on the subject of integration (see Chapter IV) and introduces an additional element of objectivity into our comparative analysis of white and Negro attitudes.

The validity of the composite integration score as an index to the respondent's position on racial integration receives further confirmation when we cross-tabulate the scores with the respondents' general attitude toward complete integration. (Table 32). Prior to securing the respondent's reaction to specific areas of racial integration, we had asked him how he felt about complete integration in general, i. e., whether he felt it to be "desirable now," or that we should "move slowly," or that it was a "bad thing." (See Table 22, Chapter IV.) When the answers to that question are cross-tabulated with the integration score, we find that 68% of the white respondents who considered it "desirable now" had a positive integration score, whereas only 1% who thought complete integration a "bad thing" had a positive score. An inverse relationship characterized those having negative integration scores.

Table 32

ATTITUDE TOWARD COMPLETE INTEGRATION, BY INTEGRATION SCORE

	Total	Complete Integration is: "Now"	"Move Slowly"	"Bad Thing"	"Don't Know"
			White Respondents		
	(507)	(116)	(278)	(84)	(29)
Integration Score:					
Positive	32%	68%	29%	1%	3%
Intermediate	34	25	44	11	45
Negative	34	7	27	88	52
			Negro Respondents		
	(519)	(320)	(180)	(5)	(14)
Integration Score:					
Positive	85%	90%	81%	20%	71%
Intermediate	14	10	17	60	29
Negative	1	0	2	20	0

A summary of the variations in integration scores according to selected characteristics of white respondents[10] appears in Table 33. Having initially classified the scores of all white respondents into three groups of equal size (positive, intermediate and negative), it is possible at a glance to see the extent to which special characteristics of the respondents are associated with an increase or decrease in the proportions of positive and negative scores. As pointed out in earlier chapters, the relationship between education and favorable attitudes recurs frequently, and is confirmed

10. A similar comparison of integration scores for various characteristics of Negro respondents was not feasible because *only one percent of all Negro respondents* had negative scores when classified on the same scale as the white respondents.

here. For example, only 17% of the respondents with a grammar school education had positive scores, whereas 57% had negative scores. The reverse was true of respondents with a college or professional school education.

Table 33

INTEGRATION SCORE, BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF WHITE RESPONDENTS

		Integration Score:		
	N=100%	Positive	Inter-mediate	Negative
Total	(505)	32%	34	34
Sex:				
Male	(127)	43%	28	29
Female	(380)	28%	37	35
Age:				
Under 35	(194)	37%	36	27
Over 50	(127)	25%	32	43
Education:				
Coll. or Prof. Sch.	(142)	51%	34	15
High School	(245)	28%	39	33
Grammar School	(118)	17%	26	57
Family Income:				
Over $7,500	(174)	42%	38	20
$5,000-$7,500	(137)	29%	33	38
Under $5,000	(139)	25%	29	46
Religion:				
Jewish	(84)	45%	38	17
Protestant	(189)	32%	37	31
Catholic	(198)	24%	30	46
Principal Occupation in Family:				
White Collar	(306)	39%	35	26
Professional	(148)	45%	40	15
Prop., Managerial	(77)	37%	36	27
Clerical	(81)	30%	26	44
Blue Collar	(152)	19%	32	49
Skilled	(87)	17%	40	43
Semi-skilled	(49)	25%	18	57
Unskilled	(16)	6%	31	63
Neighborhood:				
All-white	(340)	34%	36	30
Mostly-white	(142)	26%	32	42
Supreme Court Decision:				
Favor	(395)	37%	36	27
Oppose	(68)	18%	29	53

As could be predicted, there is no absolute relationship between any of the characteristics and the integration score. Phenomena in the field of human relations are, in most part, the product of intangible factors which are difficult to control scientifically. However, it is possible to observe the direction in which attitudes tend to move when one or more conditions are present. Thus, a white respondent with higher education working at a white collar job, and earning an annual income in excess of $7,500 will tend, on the average, to have more favorable feelings concerning racial integration than a white respondent with an elementary school education, working at a blue collar job, and earning less than $5,000 a year. Whether or not such individuals with favorable attitudes

also engage in interracial activities consistent with their professed feelings will be examined presently in Chapter VI.

For the purpose of a sharper delineation of the characteristics of white respondents who are most favorably disposed toward integration in contrast with those who are least favorably disposed, we present, in Table 34, a comparison between two groups of respondents characterized by extremely positive or extremely negative integration scores. The former (Group A) consists of the 17% of the white respondents who had scores most favorable to integration, and represent the upper stratum of the positive group in Table 31. The latter (Group B) consists of the 22% who had scores least favorable to integration, and represent the lower strata of the negative group in Table 31. Thus, Group A includes respondents most receptive, and Group B respondents least receptive to racial integration.

Comparisons between Groups A and B tend to bring into sharper focus the characteristics that are associated with greater or lesser degrees of receptivity to racial integration. For example, persons under 35 years of age appear with much greater frequency, and persons over 50 with much lesser frequency in Group A than in Group B. Comparable differences may also be observed in regard to education, family income, occupation, length of residence in Connecticut, sex, type of neighborhood, and home ownership. A special word of caution seems in order with respect to differences associated with the religious affiliation of the respondents. Although a substantially larger proportion of Catholic respondents appears in Group B, the difference between the Catholic and Protestant percentages is at least in part a function of differences in educational level between respondents in the Catholic and Protestant samples. The former was weighted heavily with persons having a grammar school education, and the latter more heavily with persons having a college education. Since receptivity to racial integration is associated with higher educational attainment of the respondent, these weights have considerable effect on the distribution according to religious affiliation. The respective educational distributions of Catholics and Protestants in the total population cannot be determined from our data.

A special note of explanation also seems in order with respect to differences in attitudes between male and female respondents. As indicated earlier, our sample included 76% female and 24% male respondents in contrast to an approximate 50-50 distribution in the total population. Our interviews were conducted during the work day when the chances of finding the employed male at home were considerably reduced. However, interviews with male respondents reflected attitudes more favorable to integration than did those of the female respondents. This was particularly true with respect to attitudes in specific areas of interracial activity. In the 14 areas included in Table 27, female attitudes tended to be less favorable than male attitudes particularly with respect to integration in various types of public accommodations, housing, and social organizations and activities. There is a real possibility that fewer opportunities for contact with Negroes by our white female respondents accounted in part for these less favorable attitudes. On the basis of replies to a

question on frequency of interracial contacts, 45% of the males in contrast to only 26% of the females said that they were having more con-

Table 34

COMPARATIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF WHITE RESPONDENTS HAVING THE MOST FAVORABLE INTEGRATION SCORE (UPPER 17%) AND THE LEAST FAVORABLE INTEGRATION SCORE (LOWER 22%)

	All Respondents (556)	Group A: Respondents with Most Favorable Score (Upper 17%) (84)	Group B: Respondents with Least Favorable Score (Lower 22%) (111)
Age:			
Under 35	37%	47%	28%
35-50	35	40	36
Over 50	28	13	36
Education:			
College	26	57	13
High School	48	35	19
Grammar School	26	8	68
Family Income:			
Over $7,500	37	55	16
$5,000-$7,500	30	23	36
Under $5,000	33	22	48
Principal Occupation in Family:			
White Collar	66	87	45
Professional	31	60	10
Proprietary	17	14	9
Clerical	18	13	26
Blue Collar	34	13	55
Skilled	20	7	28
Semi-skilled	10	6	20
Unskilled	4	0	7
Length of Residence in Connecticut:			
Less than 15 yrs.	26	49	15
15-30 years	35	33	33
Over 30 years	39	18	52
Religion:			
Jewish	16	29	6
Protestant	37	36	34
Catholic	43	19	59
Other	4	16	1
Sex:			
Male	24	33	23
Female	76	67	77
Neighborhood:			
All-white	67	71	54
Mostly-white	29	23	38
Mostly-Negro	4	6	8
Home Tenure:			
Own	64	70	59
Rent	36	30	41
Supreme Court Decision:			
Favor	76	91	49
Oppose	14	7	30
Don't know	10	2	21

tacts with Negroes today than they had had five years ago. And 29% of the female respondents said that they *never had any contacts* with Negroes, in comparison with only 11% of the male respondents.

The composite picture of the white respondent most receptive to integration that emerges from the foregoing comparison depicts him as a younger man—under 35 years of age—college educated, working at a white collar job—usually in a professional capacity—having a better than average income, and having resided in Connecticut less than 15 years. His opposite—the type of person least receptive to integration—would tend to be a woman over 35 years of age, grammar school educated, whose husband would be working at a blue collar job—either in a skilled, semi-skilled, or unskilled capacity—with a total family income of less than $5,000 annually, and would have resided in Connecticut for at least 30 years.

VI. RACIAL INTEGRATION: TYPES OF CONTACT

Along with our questions about attitudes, of which the responses were essentially subjective, we included a series of questions designed to ascertain the respondent's actual interracial contacts. The purpose of this type of question was to discover the relationship, if any, between the respondent's interracial activities and his professed attitudes.

Our first question about these activities was simply, "Do you ever meet and talk with Negroes?" Four-fifths of the white respondents said that they did. The respondent was then asked, "When was the last time you talked with a Negro—not merely to say 'hello' or 'pardon me'—but really talked together for awhile? Was it within the last week, or within the last month, or within the last year, or before that time, or never?" Replies indicated that about 60% of the whites had had such contact within the last week or month. (Table 35).

Table 35
RECENCY OF INTERRACIAL CONTACTS

	White Respondents (556)
Who met and talked with Negroes	80%
Within the last week	44
Within the last month	15
Within the last year	16
Prior to the last year	5
Who had no contact	20

A similar question to Negroes about meeting and talking with whites revealed that 97% had had such contact, and that 90% had occurred within the last week or month. (Table 36). Only a negligible proportion of both racial groups had such contact more than a year ago.

Table 36
RECENCY OF INTERRACIAL CONTACTS

	Negro Respondents (527)
Who met and talked with whites	97%
Within the last week	78
Within the last month	12
Within the last year	6
Prior to the last year	1
Who had no contact	3

White respondents with the most favorable attitudes toward racial integration, also had more frequent contacts with Negroes. Recalling that the integration score is a composite index of the respondent's attitudes toward specific areas of integration, we find that 94% of the white respondents with a positive integration score had contact with Negroes, whereas 30% with a negative score had no such contact. (Table 37).

Table 37
RECENCY OF INTERRACIAL CONTACTS, BY INTEGRATION SCORE

	White Respondents' Integration Score:		
	Positive (161)	Intermediate (175)	Negative (171)
Who met and talked with Negroes	94%	77%	70%
Within the last week	57	44	31
Within the last month	18	16	12
Within the last year	14	13	22
Prior to the last year	5	4	5
Who had no contact	6	23	30

Next, the respondents were asked, "Where and in what different situations" these interracial contacts had occurred. Generally, more than one kind of situation was mentioned; and they were grouped into the following categories: (1) *employment,* which included contacts with fellow employees, in most cases, and employer-employee relationships; (2) *organizations,* such as PTA, community and political organizations, and churches; (3) *schools,* which included teacher-pupil, and teacher-parent contacts, as well as contacts with students or teachers in high schools and colleges; (4) contacts as *friends or neighbors;* and (5) *casual,* such as contacts in stores with customers or clerks, and in places of public accommodation such as restaurants, hotels, and busses.

Some of these contacts were, to be sure, quite superficial; particularly those in the "casual" category. White respondents with a limited range of contacts usually mentioned the casual type exclusively, while others with a broader range often neglected even to refer to the casual type. Contacts at places of employment were mentioned by about half of all respondents. (Table 38).

Table 38

TYPES OF CONTACT BETWEEN WHITES AND NEGROES

	Respondents	
	White (556)	Negro (527)
Areas of Contact:[x]	80%	97%
At employment	47	56
As friends or neighbors	20	42
In organizations	18	32
At school or college	16	13
Casual	20	33
Other	3	4
No Contact	20	3

x Sub-percentages exceed total because of multiple answers.

Contacts in organizations of various types, or contacts simply as friends or neighbors (mentioned, respectively, by one-fifth of the whites), are especially significant in the integration process because of the voluntary nature of such relationships. The relatively small proportion of contacts at school or college is a function of the adult composition of our sample and does not reflect the nature of contacts between younger persons in elementary and high schools.

The frequency of contacts is also correlated with attitudes toward integration. Whether at employment, in organizations, at schools and colleges, or as friends and neighbors, contacts were significantly greater for respondents with positive integration scores than for those with negative scores. (Table 39).

Table 39

TYPES OF CONTACT BETWEEN WHITES AND NEGROES, BY INTEGRATION SCORE

	White Respondents' Integration Score: Positive (161)	Intermediate (175)	Negative (171)
Areas of Contact: [x]	94%	77%	70%
At employment	59	44	39
As friends or neighbors	32	15	14
In organizations	26	22	7
At school or college	23	15	12
Casual	23	16	23
Other	4	2	3
No Contact	6	23	30

x Sub-percentages exceed total because of multiple answers.

The pattern of positive correlation between favorable integration attitudes and level of formal education of the respondents, discussed in earlier chapters, is also exhibited in areas of interracial contact. The better educated persons of both races utilize various channels of interracial contact more frequently than those with more limited education. (Table 40).

Our data seem to indicate a substantial degree of consistency between the integration attitudes of our respondents and the range and frequency of their interracial contacts. Sociological studies made elsewhere have attempted to show that there is no necessary relationship between interracial attitudes and activities. For example, Saenger found that prejudicial attitudes toward Negro sales clerks in department stores did not prevent white customers from patronizing Negro clerks as frequently as they patronized whites.[11] In an earlier study, LaPiere found, after he and a Chinese married couple had been accepted at many hotels and restaurants while travelling across the United States, that a subsequent letter to these same hotels and restaurants received replies from most of them to the effect that they would not accept members of the Chinese race as guests.[12] These studies are interesting and provocative, and undeniably they show a difference between attitude and act. However, since they deal with limited types of interracial situations, the findings would scarcely warrant any broad generalization on the nature of the inconsistency between prejudicial attitudes and actions; at least until additional evidence is introduced from other areas of interracial activity. Because of the relatively impersonal nature of the transaction involved in buying from a Negro clerk, it is possible that the prejudiced customer will go through with it regardless of his feelings. The prejudiced person might strive for more consistency in his behavior if the act involved a threat to personal values. Also, any interpretation of the contradictory behavior of the hotel and restaurant proprietors must take into account the fact that the Chinese husband and wife *were accompanied* by a white man. How the proprietors would have acted if only the Chinese couple had appeared, or had been accompanied by other Chinese persons, remains open to conjecture.

11. Saenger, *op. cit.*, pp. 237-239.
12. LaPiere, *op. cit.*, pp. 230-237.

Table 40

TYPES OF CONTACT BETWEEN WHITES AND NEGROES, BY EDUCATION

	Grammar Sch. or some High School	H.S. grad., T.S. grad., some College	College or Prof. Sch. Graduate
	White Respondents		
Areas of Contact: x	(142)	(264)	(144)
At employment	67%	78%	90%
As friends or neighbors	35	45	56
In organizations	18	16	24
At school or college	4	17	30
Casual	7	16	20
Other	18	22	18
No Contact	3	3	3
	33	22	10
	Negro Respondents		
Areas of Contact: x	(165)	(241)	(83)
At employment	94%	97%	100%
As friends or neighbors	42	54	67
In organizations	30	40	61
At school or college	14	33	53
Casual	9	12	20
Other	29	35	14
No Contact	6	4	1
	6	3	0

x Sub-percentages exceed total because of multiple answers.

We are well aware of the fact that our own data on interracial contacts are based on evidence given by our respondents, and not on actual observation of such activities by our interviewers. To check activities in a wide variety of interracial situations would have required a prohibitive expenditure of time and resources. The procedure we followed—that of asking the respondents to enumerate their interracial activities—represented the best available alternative. The internal consistency in the answers given to a wide range of questions on various phases of integration leads us to believe that our respondents, whether prejudiced or unprejudiced, made an honest attempt to convey their feelings and describe their activities to our interviewers.

With regard to the future status of contacts between whites and Negroes in Connecticut, a far greater proportion of Negro than white respondents felt that there should be more interracial contact. More than four-fifths of the Negro respondents, compared with about one-third of the white respondents, felt that whites and Negroes "should get together more." Forty-five percent of the whites felt that things were "all right as they are," and 8% felt that there should be less interracial contact. (Table 41).

Table 41

ATTITUDES TOWARD MORE CONTACT BETWEEN WHITES AND NEGROES

	Respondents	
	White (556)	Negro (527)
Whites and Negroes:		
"Should get together more"	35%	84%
"Things are all right as they are"	45	12
"Should get together less"	8	0
"Don't know"	12	4

The wide difference between what white and Negro respondents want in the way of racial integration recurs throughout our inquiry whether we focus our attention on general attitudes toward integration, or on specific attitudes as reflected in the integration score. But another facet of this problem that demands our attention is the mistaken conception held by white respondents of what Negroes want in this regard. Quite late in the course of each interview, after we had already secured the respondents' own views on various aspects of integration, we asked them for their opinion of what they thought other whites and Negroes wanted in the way of integration. The question was, "We've asked your own opinion about racial integration. Now, do you think that most white people in Connecticut feel there should be more integration, or that it's all right the way it is, or that there should be less of it?" This was followed by a similar question asking the white respondent's opinion on how Negroes felt concerning integration. And Negro respondents were asked similar questions relating to attitudes held by whites and *other Negroes*. The replies to these questions are presented in Table 42, and should be interpreted in conjunction with data presented in Table 41.

Table 42

ATTITUDES TOWARD RACIAL INTEGRATION

	White Respondents' evaluation of:		Negro Respondents' evaluation of:	
	What Whites Want	What Negroes Want	What Whites Want	What Negroes Want
	(A) (556)	(B) (556)	(C) (527)	(D) (527)
"More integration"	44%	10%	17%	69%
"All right the way it is"	18	48	45	16
"Less integration"	2	16	11	3
"Don't know"	36	26	27	12

The facts that emerge from these comparisons are (1) that white respondents tend to feel that other whites (Table 42) are more in favor of integration than they are themselves (Table 41); (2) that Negro respondents tend to underestimate the proportion of whites who want more integration (Table 42) in comparison with what whites actually wanted (Table 41); (3) that Negro respondents tend to underestimate the proportion of other Negroes wanting more integration (Table 42) in comparison with what they wanted themselves (Table 41); and (4) that white respondents tend to grossly underestimate the proportion of Negroes wanting more integration (10%, Table 42) in comparison with the 84% of Negro respondents who actually said that they wanted more integration (Table 41).

The wide discrepancy between the Negroes' professed goals in the extension of racial integration and the whites' conception of what Negroes want is most significant. The white community could play a decisive role in the furtherance of integration, but seems to be handicapped both by a lack of enthusiasm for integration as well as a miscomprehension of the feelings of the Negro community.

Respondents who felt that whites and Negroes "should get together more" were then asked what they had actually done, based on a check-list of such activities, to encourage interracial relations. It was felt that answers to this question would provide a valuable clue to the channels of interracial communication utilized by those persons who were most favorably disposed toward the extension of integration. Among white respondents, such activities as "starting conversations" with Negroes, or attendance at interracial meetings ranked highest, but did not necessarily imply any depth of interracial contact. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that about half of the white respondents said that they had joined interracial organizations, or invited Negroes to their homes, or accepted an invitation from Negroes. More than a third said that they had invited Negroes to join their clubs, organizations, or churches. (Table 43). A similar question asked of the Negro respondents indicated a greater assumption of initiative with regard to the same activities.

Table 43

INTERRACIAL ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN BY RESPONDENTS WHO FELT THERE SHOULD BE MORE INTEGRATION

White Respondents	Total (189)	Total (433)	Negro Respondents
Starting a conversation with a Negro	80%	82%	Starting a conversation with a white person
Going to a public meeting where you knew there would be many Negroes	59	82	Going to a public meeting where you knew there would be many white persons
Joining a club or organization with a racially mixed membership	51	61	Joining a club or organization with a racially mixed membership
Inviting a Negro to a club, organization, or church you belong to	36	52	Inviting a white person to a club, organization, or church you belong to
Inviting a Negro to your home	50	74	Inviting a white person to your home
Accepting an invitation from a Negro	47	74	Accepting an invitation from a white person

NOTE: Percentages exceed 100 because of multiple answers.

As a closing question in the interview, each respondent was asked if he could think of anything that people in Connecticut could do to improve race relations. Although the field of integration and race relations had been thoroughly covered, it was felt that this question might afford the respondent an opportunity to make some suggestion that perhaps was paramount in his mind. In general, the answers tended to recapitulate our previous findings. Both white and Negro respondents were agreed that more opportunities should be made available for Negroes in the basic fields of employment, education, housing, and public accommodations. However, there was one noteworthy difference: about twice the proportion of Negro (44%) than white (21%) respondents felt that there should be more social interaction between whites and Negroes. Negro respondents especially expressed the desire for greater social acceptance as individuals, and as members of clubs and organizations. The Negro, more than the white, seems to be conscious of the fact that being able to get a job or buy a house is not the ultimate in racial integration. He also wants to be accepted as an equal in the community.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

Our nearly 1100 interviews with white and Negro citizens in Connecticut provide an inventory of the interracial attitudes and practices of a cross-section of persons living in the metropolitan areas where they are most immediately affected by racial interaction or the prospect of such interaction. It is important to remember that the opinions were recorded in private interviews in which the respondent was expressing his independent views, anonymously, and without any clue as to what other persons interviewed had said.

The attitudes of the 527 Negroes thus interviewed etched a crystal-clear picture. There is no aspect of our Connecticut community life with regard to which as many as one Negro in ten was opposed to complete racial integration. For most areas of activity, the ratio of Negroes opposed to integration fell closer to one in one-hundred. Furthermore, nearly two-thirds wanted complete racial integration, defined as "Negroes and whites taking part together, without regard to race, in everything that goes on in the community," *now*.

In contrast, the attitudes of the 556 white persons interviewed presented a much more complex picture. They displayed, in general, a decidedly ambivalent attitude toward integration, apparently viewing the community scene as one made up of discrete situations, in some of which integration is quite acceptable, in others not at all.

Nevertheless, some generalizations about their attitudes are possible. There was no aspect of Connecticut community life about which a majority of the white respondents expressed downright opposition to racial integration. However, no matter what the area of activity examined, no matter how long discrimination and differential treatment in that particular type of situation had been illegal in Connecticut, approximately 25% of the white group merely tolerated integration—they "accepted but did not encourage."

On the other hand, no matter what kind of situation was involved (even including private social gatherings), the percentage of the white group which favored integration never fell below 28%. It is reasonable to believe that the minimum figure would have been somewhat higher (possibly no less than one-third in favor of integration in any specific activity) if men had been represented equally with women among the white respondents, since the men interviewed were generally a little more favorably disposed toward integration than the women.

On the basis of these findings, it would be impossible to view the interracial situation in Connecticut today as one characterized by complete harmony. On the other hand, it is obviously not one in which white and Negro groups form opposing camps. What the overwhelming majority of Negroes favor, the majority of whites do not actively oppose—although many *are* opposed and others are decidedly lukewarm toward racial integration in some of the situations in which Negroes almost unanimously desire it, especially in the field of housing.

The largest portion of the white group (45%) felt that interracial matters in Connecticut were "all right as they are now." In general, as a group the white respondents appeared to be somewhat uninformed regarding such matters. For a quarter of the entire white group (and for half of those who had not graduated from high school), it was necessary

to explain what racial integration meant before their attitudes toward it could be elicited. More than 20% of the white respondents had not talked with a Negro for many months, while another 20% said they had never had a personal conversation with a Negro.

White respondents erred especially in their interpretation of Negro aspirations. Only 10% judged that Negroes wanted to "get together more with whites," while 84% of the Negroes actually expressed the desire to do so. Nearly half of the white group felt that Negroes were quite satisfied with the present situation. It is quite surprising that the white respondents attributed to whites a much greater desire for racial integration than to Negroes. Nearly half of the white group felt that whites wanted more integration. This judgment was not too inaccurate, since 35% of the white respondents actually expressed the desire to "get together more" with Negroes—but when combined with the fact that only a tenth of the whites felt that *Negroes* wanted more integration, it seems to indicate a gross misconception among white persons in Connecticut as to who is holding back and who is pushing forward where racial integration is concerned.

The Negroes interviewed revealed a more correct understanding of the prevailing climate of opinion in Connecticut, but their misjudgments were interesting. Nearly half of the Negroes correctly judged that for most whites the interracial situation here is "all right as it is." However, only 17% of the Negroes felt that white Connecticut residents wanted more racial integration, while 35% of the whites expressed the desire to "get together more" with Negroes. And Negroes underestimated by 15% the desire of other Negroes for more integration. Apparently, the climate of opinion is considerably more favorable to increased racial integration than Negroes assumed, even though they, more than whites, tended to see progress in this field during the past five years.

While the total picture of white attitudes was complex and diverse, individual white respondents tended to show a considerable degree of consistency and integrity in the attitudes they expressed and the actions they reported. For example, three-quarters of the white respondents favored the Supreme Court decision of integrating the public schools, and 70% also expressed approval of integrated public schools in Connecticut. Thus, they did not expect others to do what they were not wholly willing to do themselves. The 25% who merely tolerated school integration here did not prescribe it for the South by voicing approval of the Supreme Court decision. The white respondents who favored integration "across the board" tended to have and to initiate more contacts with Negroes, and their contacts were of a less impersonal nature than those of persons who expressed reservations about racial integration. Whether the favorable attitudes resulted from the contacts or the contacts followed from the favorable attitudes, it is impossible to say.

An interesting individual finding concerns integration in churches. Whites favored integration in churches to approximately the same extent that they favored integration in the public schools. Since 91% of the Negroes interviewed also favored church integration and only 7% of the whites opposed it, it would seem that complete integration of our churches could proceed without delay, and it might well precede rather than follow neighborhood integration.

When we selected racial integration as a focal point for orienting the views of our respondents, we were fully aware that it is a concept subject to diverse interpretations. Some may consider Negroes to be integrated if they are permitted to eat near whites in the same restaurants; others would consider them integrated only if there were opportunity for social interaction in the situations involved; and still others would consider integration a reality only when Negroes are accepted as individuals on a basis of full equality in all situations, without any stigma of racial inferiority, either social or psychological, expressed or implied.

Recognizing that we were going to interview persons with widely differing educational and cultural backgrounds, we sought to minimize differences of interpretation by stating, and restating the problem in simple, comprehensible terms. Thus, after securing their attitudes toward total integration as defined in broad, general terms, we proceeded to probe attitudes toward integration in specific situations, and followed this with a further refinement in the form of questions on actual interracial experiences. The internal consistency we discovered in responses to these various types of questions seems to indicate a basic understanding of the nature of the problem.

Any attempt to evaluate the significance of these findings would lead to a gross distortion if they were separated from the context of the Connecticut scene. Certain types of racial integration, such as equality of voting rights, and public school integration have been achievements of long standing in Connecticut, and actually outside the realm of controversy. Negroes and whites are served equally in places of public accommodation, with only rare exceptions. Equality of opportunity in employment has moved ahead so rapidly in the past decade that lack of education or training may be considered a greater impediment than skin color in job opportunities for Negroes.

However, there is more cause for concern when we look at other areas of integration, where progress is real, but slower and where the less favorable attitudes of whites coincide with the actual situation. It is probably in these areas that the relative intransigence of whites precipitates the greater impatience among Negroes, and the Negro is constantly reminded of the cachet of alleged inferiority that relegates him to an inferior status in the community. In the area of private housing, for example, the achievement of integrated neighborhoods continues to meet with considerable opposition—a situation that reflects the attitudes found among our white respondents.

Even in the area of public housing, where integration in Connecticut moved rapidly forward in recent years, public housing authorities have found increasing difficulty in maintaining an integrated pattern without imposing a quota on the proportion of Negroes admitted to any project. Although the Commission on Civil Rights does not condone such quotas, some housing authorities have felt that integration patterns cannot be maintained if the proportion of Negro families exceeds 30-40% of the total. Whether a similar situation would develop in private housing with the influx of any substantial number of Negro families is open to conjecture. There is some evidence that private neighborhoods will retain their interracial character after Negro families have moved in.

For example, in a study[12] made in 1957 based on Connecticut data, it was found that about half of the white families in integrated private neighborhoods moved in after Negro families already resided there. On the other hand, experience elsewhere[13] has pointed up the problem of maintaining integrated patterns in private housing developments when the ratio of Negro families increases. It seems that whites are usually more favorably disposed to go along with housing integration if it is the Negro families who are being integrated into a situation where the whites are in the majority, but tend to look with disfavor upon being integrated into a situation where the Negro families are in the majority.

Furthermore, the problem of maintaining integration in the housing field when the ratio of Negro families increases may be symptomatic of a more serious integration problem that might develop if there were an abrupt increase in the number of Negroes in the state's population. At the moment, Negroes constitute only about 5% of the state's total population and probably do not exceed 10% in any of the principal cities. The proportion is very small in suburban or rural areas. In a number of instances in the course of our interviews with white respondents, we noted the tendency to qualify favorable attitudes toward integration with the statement "as long as there are not too many Negroes."

On the other hand, any aggravation of the problem because of increase in numbers could be at least partially offset by an increase in the general level of formal education in both racial groups. Our data show quite conclusively that attitudes toward general and specific areas of integration are more favorable and that more channels of communication between the races are maintained by the better educated white or Negro respondents. It would seem particularly important to prevent the emergence of any semblance of a voluntary pattern of segregation in the public schools, a danger that is inherent in Northern cities whenever a pattern of residential segregation is allowed to develop.

Although a majority of white and Negro respondents felt that the Southern school desegregation drive had had some effect on race relations in Connecticut, and that the effect had been more positive than negative, we must recognize that the respondents unconsciously might have had some difficulty in separating that series of events, as a causative factor, from others that were taking shape during the period when we were conducting our interviews. We refer to the sit-in demonstrations in the South and the accelerating movement for African independence abroad. All of these events contributed to increasing the Negro's sense of dignity and pride in his race, and certainly would stimulate his impatience with the traditional varieties of discrimination to which Negroes are subjected even though far removed from the more publicized centers of overt racial conflict.

Although incapable of proof, we feel that the overwhelming demand of our Negro respondents for complete integration in Connecticut is inseparably a part of the rising protest of the colored races everywhere against discrimination and exploitation. This is why our Negro respondents, in their replies, were not concerned exclusively with better opportunities in employment, education, public accommodations, and housing,

12. Stetler, *Private Interracial Neighborhoods In Connecticut*, p. 7.
13. Grier, Eunice and George, *Buyers of Interracial Housing*, Philadelphia, Univ. of Penna. Institute for Urban Studies, 1957.

areas in which non-discrimination is covered by statute—but were also concerned with more opportunity for social interaction, and more inclusive integration in the social fabric of the community. They are, in effect, becoming increasingly impatient with the prospect of having to withdraw—after the day's job is done or school classes are concluded—within the social and psychological barriers of the invisible ghetto. This seems to be one of the paramount findings that emerges from our data, and it needs to be recognized as a basic ingredient for understanding the Negro's position on racial integration.

The attitudes and practices of our white respondents in substance reflect a desire to move more slowly, and perhaps more cautiously than Negroes toward the goal of integration. Although very few whites expressed outright opposition to integration in public schools or employment, the rate of opposition increased progressively in areas where racial interaction involved the acceptance of Negroes on a level of social equality. We have demonstrated that this tendency among white respondents to be selective, or in effect to "pick-and-choose" the areas of permissible interracial activity is associated, in varying degrees, with certain characteristics or attributes of these respondents. Although there is a substantial reservoir of goodwill in favor of integration among all strata of the white population, it seems that the rate of integration could be accelerated by beaming an educational program toward those segments of the white population that at the moment seem least committed to the proposition of racial integration.

Although education has considerable influence on the individual's attitude toward integration, it would be impractical to suggest that we wait for a solution of the problem until all persons become better educated. While there is every indication that more persons will go to college in the next generation, there still will be many who probably will not go beyond high school, or trade and business schools. Persons who terminate their education at these levels should be given every opportunity to examine and discuss problems of intergroup relations while still in school.

The large proportion of adults in the population who have severed their ties with any formal educational discipline need to be encouraged to examine, or re-examine, their attitudes and behavior toward Negroes, and in fact toward any minority group that suffers from discrimination. It seems that this could best be achieved through the existing institutions and organizations with which they are affiliated. Here the churches which are already committed in principle to non-discrimination could exert a major influence. Our white respondents, along with the Negro respondents, were largely in favor of integration in the churches, and any further achievements in this direction would provide opportunities for whites and Negroes to increase interracial contacts which are so essential to breaking down prejudice. In a similar way, other organizations such as service clubs, fraternal groups and even many organizations devoted almost exclusively to social activities should be stimulated to removal of color bars to membership. Because women on the average have fewer contacts with persons of other races, and also have less favorable attitudes toward integration, it would be desirable to encourage organizations limited to women members to do everything possible toward broadening their membership to include persons of other races. It also seems

that the labor unions should be encouraged to step up their existent anti-discrimination programs because our data revealed a relatively high proportion of negative integration scores among persons engaged in the skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled occupations.

Important as legislation may be for the control of discriminatory acts against persons of other racial, religious, or ethnic origin, such laws are not sufficient by themselves to bring about changes in the climate of opinion with respect to intergroup problems. And it should always be borne in mind that acceptance of the principle of racial integration need not deprive any individual of the right to choose his friends or associates; rather it would seek to eliminate a prejudgment of the individual's worth or qualities on the basis of race or color.